

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## KENTUCKY, A PICTORIAL HISTORY

## HON. MARLOW W. COOK

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, Kentucky, A Pictorial History, of which the distinguished Kentucky historian, J. Winston Coleman, Jr., was editor, Thomas D. Clark and Lawrence S. Thompson, associate editors, and Clyde T. Burke, photographic editor, was published in the fall of 1971 by the University Press of Kentucky with the cooperation of the department of parks and the department of public information of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, after more than 2 years of careful preparation. Mr. Burke, formerly with the Department of Parks, is now the director of the Waveland Museum, a shrine of Kentucky culture about four miles from Lexington. Mr. Thompson is professor of classical languages and literature at the University of Kentucky. The principal contributors were: Charles L. Atcher, Edward L. Bowen, Jacqueline Bull, Rabel J. Burdge, Gayle Carver, Kenneth and Mary Clarke, A. Lee Coleman, Jr., Henry H. Craig, Joe Creason, W. Jerome Crouch, J. Crawford Crowe, Henry G. Crowgey, Leonard P. Curry, Richard B. Drake, Clement Eaton, Joseph A. Estes, Thomas P. Field, Elizabeth D. Gilbert, Mary Wilma Hargreaves, Henry Harned, Lowell H. Harrison, Danny R. Hatcher, Charles F. Hinds, Albert D. Kirwan, Clay Lancaster, Mary Elizabeth Leach, Burton Milward, Julia Neal, William Russell Rice, Charles Gano Talbert, Hambleton Tapp, Rhea A. Taylor, Arnold Washburn, John D. Wright, Jr.

The foreword was written by Mr. Clark, retired "distinguished professor of American history" at the University of Kentucky, presently holding a similar position at Indiana University, widely recognized as one of the outstanding historians of our Nation, official and guiding spirit of regional and national historical associations, conservationist, and dedicated Kentuckian.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the foreword be printed in the RECORD so that others may have the opportunity to read this excellent, albeit brief, description of the geography of my beautiful State and history of its people.

There being no objection, the foreword was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## FOREWORD

Between the pinch of mountain range and river valleys, the land of Kentucky forms a strange lump of geography, which defies geometrical description. From the narrows of the rocky Big Sandy Gorge to the dangling penultimate island which nestles against the shoulders of Tennessee and Missouri on the Mississippi River, it is indeed a land of contrasts. That its human history should be so varied and erratic is not surprising. The long valleys which slice its eastern Appalachian face and those deep channels cut

through depthless limestone domes by rivers which have ground away at the rock for centuries on end—all have witnessed processions of human beings. One may stand on the banks of Station Camp Creek, the Salt, the Bayou de Chien, Kinniconick, Barren, and Noln and conjure up visions of American pioneers forcing their way through the wilderness to build cabins and plant new beachheads of civilization.

Long before an Anglo-American hunter penetrated the eastern mountain and river passes into Kentucky, there were prehistoric men who called the land their home. These peoples left their bodies, pottery, weapons, and utensils to be puzzled over and studied by archaeologists and anthropologists of the future, and to become the prized possessions of collectors.

The opening of Kentucky to settlement in the latter half of the eighteenth century was one of the truly dramatic incidents of American pioneering. It was not a civilization of originality that the first arrival this side of the mountains planted along the western watershed so much as it was the adaptation of an older one to a new environment, a rugged topography, and raw nature. There were few areas along the American frontier where men studded the landscape with so many visible landmarks of local interest as in Kentucky. All across the state these landmarks remain either in fact or in memory as monuments to the act of settlement.

Just as the prehistoric people documented their presence with burial sites and artifacts, the pioneers left behind abundant evidence of their existence. They left a rich legacy of primitive tools, weapons, utensils, instruments, and examples of their handicrafts. No greater contribution was made to early Kentucky than that of the early craftsmen who fashioned practical implements and some really elegant pieces of furniture from the virgin woods which they found growing on the spots where they built their cabins. These were the creations of a way of life, which now reveal what it was like to live in another time.

No act of pioneering drama took place without cost to human beings. There were the fierce pioneers who resisted Indian raids, those who struggled with the elements and the land, and those who laid foundations for human institutions. All of these have been fused into an image of men garbed in homespun and crude leather, weatherburned and calloused, experts with ox, plow, gun, and froe, inured to hardships, and predestinarian in philosophy. These were the faceless ones who patiently cleared openings in the forest, built homes and towns, and who grazed animals and produced farm products for new western markets. These were the ones who trampled primitive forest trails into highways, furrowed the soil, and in time rode pitching flatboats down the great rivers in search of merchants and cash for the products of field, smokehouse, and still.

Kentucky, however, had plenty of faces among its pioneers, of individuals whose names personified much of the broader westward movement, even well beyond the borders of the state. In an ever-shifting human drama, bucks-kinned woodsmen now turned Kentuckians; prosperous farmers, local and national politicians, doctors, professors, preachers, artists, authors, newspaper editors, soldiers, and scientists were to exert far-flung influence. It was they who in time gave Kentucky history its profound personal quality.

Political foundations and expansion in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries involved both men and events in movements which stirred the whole national scene. Ken-

tuckians formed a state after debating and compromising controversial political theories and issues. They fought in regional and national wars, they helped to compromise explosive national issues and to create others, they sat in legislative halls and in Congress, at peace tables, and served at foreign courts as diplomats. They rushed ahead with the spreading American frontiers to the West and South to help form new states, to sit in governors' chairs, to preside as judges, and to lift voices in legislative oratory. Ever, the Kentuckian has been a political animal. He has adorned his public halls and his archival and art collections with graphic evidence of this fact in the forms of busts, portraits, commissions, and political memorabilia.

In a more refined vein the settlers brought in their saddlebags the germs of institutional culture. They raised churches and schools, and established libraries, special interest societies, towns and communities on the face of the land. These they nurtured from one generation to the next. From the old Mulkey Meeting House in Monroe County to the sophisticated Speed Museum of Art in Louisville, cultural landmarks in the state are plentiful. Also, the monuments to recurring eras of economic growth reflect the impact of the farmer, the merchant, miner, industrialist, and the artisan.

Hardly had the first settler leaned his broadaxe against a tree before the age of economic change was upon Kentucky. Racing headlong into the future, communities have flourished or perished as they were favored or spurned by the constant process of economic revolution in America. In both eastern and western Kentucky miners have tunneled the bowels of the earth to gather millions of tons of precious coal; in an even more ravenous mood they have scarred the land with their behemoth strip-mining machines. They have mauled and destroyed blocks of forests, choked streams, and left evidence of their avarice that future generations will shudder at. Industrial sites have been developed all over the state. There are those also which mark the existence of industries no longer in existence. Old iron furnaces, for instance, tell stories of another age and another dream of prosperity.

Once fine country homes have disappeared or are slowly melting into the landscape from neglect and decay. This reflects not only a changing pattern of the agrarian way of life in Kentucky, but also a well-nigh complete shift in the nature of family organization and attitudes. What once was a strongly centralized patriarchal, family-based society has now lost ground to a more detached urban way of life. The older homes are still cherished, but the new pattern is ring after ring of town and suburban houses which within themselves document the rapidly changing nature of human organization in Kentucky.

The landscape of Kentucky has become striped in recent years with double ribbons of super high-speed roads. In many instances these all but obliterate the trails over which pioneers struggled westward with families and pack animals. Thus it is that the history of Kentucky has ever been one of contrast and change. It may at times have been frustrating and self-defeating in nature. At others it may have had its glorious and satisfying moments, but it has never been dull. Even the most illiterate and deprived Kentuckians have exhibited strong personal pride, expressed sometimes in forms of heedless anger and violence, but at other times in the warmest possible terms of humanity and dignity. The variety often is too great and too complex for the historian to capture in word

and phrase, or even to document from trusted and objective sources.

The camera can be more discerning as to detail. So can the cartographer and geographer. They can locate and portray with dependable precision the finer distinctions of the rich and exciting contrasts.

If the human side of Kentucky presents contrasts of spiritual subtleties, the face of the land offers an even greater variety of beauty and nostalgic appeal. Caught in the focus of the photographer's lens or on an artist's canvas, it stands revealed in its power, its starkness, sometimes in ugliness, but always in detail. Contained in this volume are the portraits of landmarks, men, and events which have related Kentuckians to their land and the times. It portrays the degree in which they have cooperated with their environment, and in which they have spurned it. This volume is wide ranging in scope of space and time, institutional growth, in humanity, and, most of all, in portraying the changes of a dynamic society. In its simple clarity, it graphically documents the advances Kentuckians have made on the wider scale of American civilization and the degree to which they have retained their regional individuality.

THOMAS D. CLARK.

JUNE 12, 1971

#### DEPOPULATION AND POVERTY

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the big picture of what is happening in the rural areas of southwest Minnesota and northwest Iowa is "depopulation and poverty."

To try to find answers to these problems, a 10-county conference was held on January 18 at the Worthington State Junior College.

Among the interesting papers presented was one, "Industrial Development" by William Robert Soleta, a realtor of Windom.

I would like to share Mr. Soleta's thoughts with my colleagues by inserting his paper in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The comments follow:

#### INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

(By Wm. Robert Soleta)

"The big picture" of what is happening in the rural areas of Southwest Minnesota and Northwest Iowa is "depopulation and poverty." Americans don't like to be losers, worse yet when the winners become the losers.

"The winners" the remaining farmers of today are the best in the world. Their capabilities have supplied the United States with unlimited food and fiber, plus a surplus for export.

However, if you couple excessive productivity with the failure of our government and our international sales force to put these valuable resources into a distribution system to where they are needed you spell disaster for our farmers.

The local result of this overall situation is an ever narrowing margin between the cost of production and the sale price of the farm products put into the market. This narrowing margin causes the farmer to use, to the best of his ability, more productive seed, fertilizer, feed additives, productive equipment and better practices. The end result being, the forced displacement of the farmer's own sons, smaller farmers and future

farmers. All of this "push" is necessary just to retain his net earnings at a worthwhile level. This struggle has also raised the farmer's age level to 58 years, making farming "an old man's game." This has become true not by desire but by economic pressures.

Who will replace these skilled retiring farmers? They will be replaced partially by greater investment in machines, or technical advancement, but the final replacement must be by new skilled young farmers, diversified individuals, and specialists.

There is something very curious about our rural area, we EXPORT raw materials in the form of feed grain, young people, high school graduates, displaced farmers, and the money that our people invest in mutual funds, bonds, shares, most of which leaves the local area. Raw material, people and money are three necessary ingredients for economic growth and we ship them out. HOW STUPID CAN WE BE? What can we do to change this? We must adopt a policy of processing all our raw material "one step farther" before we ship it out. We must apply technology, management, and salesmanship to these basic commodities of raw material, people and money.

A metropolitan banker recently said, "Show me an ultra-conservative small town banker and I'll show you a man who is killing his community". Is this our problem? Has our money been so hard-earned that we are not willing to risk it here? Don't kid yourself, someone else is taking our money and risking it somewhere else—processing our raw materials and employing our displaced people. Is it also the lack of "leadership" in our educational systems that is causing our good people to be up-rooted and used in someone else's industry? Our people already have a background training and understanding that is available for this one step further processing of our raw materials.

Three forms of industrialization must take place in the rural areas to raise our economic level, they are:

1. The production of food.
2. The processing of food.
3. The manufacture and assembly of products for local and national resale.

Just as we have industrial manufacturing parks being built in each progressive city in our area, why can't we create Agricultural Industrial Parks where these additional skills of technology, money and people, management and the use of raw materials can be developed into gross national products. We should draw together our risk capital that someone is using and build the confinement feeding systems for cattle, hogs, and poultry that meet PCA requirements and couple them with the high school and adult agricultural-vocational school programs, so that the father of a farm boy or individual doesn't have to take such extreme risks before he is trained in the processing of raw materials—"the one step further"—before letting them leave the area.

These Agricultural Industrial Parks are not intended to be competitors to our free enterprise farmer, but rather the training ground for the expanded specialized use of raw material, people and money.

As a tax incentive for new industry to locate in a community I would suggest an abatement of the Social Service budgets of the Real Estate taxes. This would amount to 60-70% of the tax bill, yet the industry would pay for services rendered to it's real estate. After all this industry has not created a welfare or school problem, but it can solve it by providing worthwhile jobs. What is more important the \$6,000 real estate taxes on a new industrial building or the \$300 per family of real estate taxes on the 200 new job holders for an amount of \$60,000.

In the area of financing with SBA—conventional and the new authorized city bonds, the loan portion is pretty well covered. It's

the equity or risk capital that presents the problem. I worked on the sale of local stocks for the Windom Industrial Development Corporation, most of the refusals we got were because the individual figured it wouldn't do them any good. Whether it is individual, employee, business man or industry there is good reason for us all to invest in our local Industrial Development Corp.

More jobs expand the labor pool, increasing business and insures the investment in our homes and other real estate because, where there are jobs there is demand for goods and services.

It is just as important to present employees and future ones to have seed capital to provide new buildings and equipment for jobs. Just as employees contribute for union dues, they could contribute \$1 per month for industrial research and development. In Windom with 1500 jobs this would create \$18,000 per year or \$180,000 or more in 10 years. A small price to pay for generating new jobs.

Reversing the flow of job seekers into the big city is near impossible unless you provide a job opportunity before that person leaves. One of our local personnel men said he interviewed 36 applicants to fill three job openings and then complained he couldn't find enough help. The 33 who walked away were still looking for jobs. If we could provide one here those same people would not be causing unemployment and welfare problems in the big city, compounding the whole mess.

Industry looks for cheaper overhead in all forms balanced by productivity of the employee, coupled with available raw materials and good distribution. This is where the philosophy of processing our products one step further really counts. We have it first; why let it go. An industry employing women in the rural area really puts a boost in the local economy. The earning per family is raised sharply to create a better standard of living. We can thank Fingerhut and Toro Mfg. for this in Windom. They in turn have said thanks in return by adding new jobs because of productivity per employee.

Many urban problems such as pollution, transportation, crowding and schools have caused manufacturers and top level employers to look at spacious rural communities. The awake smaller town that has most of the necessary service facilities, good schools, health service, housing, summer and winter recreational facilities are getting favorable consideration.

The manufacturing industrial parks of each developing city should always have a vacant speculation building for the relocation or expansion of an industry as long as it is determined there is an available supply of labor. It should especially have a 6000 square foot building for the pilot operation of the very smallest of manufactures who want to give it a try. Just as we provide a home for people, we should also provide a home for new industry. They cannot wait six months for a maybe. When we lose our available supply of labor we also lose the need for money and raw materials for further growth.

There is one gross inequity in our system of taxation that adds to the narrowing margin in farming. That is the taxing of real estate to support social services, such as health, education and welfare. A farmer must use large quantities of real estate to make a living. Therefore he pays from five to twelve times more to educate his children than does his fellow citizen in the same income category. The only difference is their method of employment.

Our educational leaders preach that a good education, gives a better job income throughout life, yet they continue to promote the use of real estate tax—"an unrelated source of taxation"—to support education. They may some day be one of the unemployed, disabled or retired that can no longer afford to

keep their real estate because of this unrealistic tax system burden.

If we believe in education, free enterprise and the capitalistic system, then let us use the Profits of the system to pay the expenses of its operation. Any banker, accountant, manufacturer, farmer, businessman, or laborer can tell you profits are the only way you can pay the expense of any operation including education. If we remove the unjust tax burden from the farmer, improve our processing ability, expand our use of money, improve our technology and yet are not able to sell our farm products locally or abroad at a profit we will still have a sick economy.

I liken our farmers as to raindrops in a cloud, each drop does not create much water, but put them all together and you have a cloudburst that fills the streams of distribution to flood stage. Too much food and fiber, like too much water is a waste unless properly controlled. If we can't sell or barter the foods in our streams of distribution, then we must control it at its origin—at the same time properly compensating those who must produce it. If we do not—the source shall surely fall.

It has been said "cheap food" is a "political policy" of the U.S.A. If this is true, then those who preach the policy of cheap food shall also fail. Slavery of our farmers shall also fail to produce a world-wide supply of food for all.

My fellow citizens, politicians, educators, farmers, industrialists, and business people, we must gather together now to solve these problems or we will become part of this national failure. On Dec. 30, 1971, C.B.S. TV Report, the one glaring statement that stood out above all others was—"the U.S. economic strength is the strongest of all forces in the shaping and controlling of world peace." After I returned from eight years of service in the U.S. Air Force in World War II and during the Korean conflict, I met Senator Humphrey at the Windom high school and asked him at that time, "why is it with all the smart people in Washington, can't they see that our surplus food is the greatest weapon we have for world peace". I am sure Senator Humphrey was a supporter of the food for peace program. Let us all carry on this program by employing our greatest assets "the American farmer" and his creative ability in producing this weapon of peace.

As Dad used to holler up the farmhouse stairway at 5:30 Monday morning, "Everybody up; the day after tomorrow is the middle of the week and you ain't got a damn thing done yet."

#### SPACE SHUTTLE, PLATFORM FOR EARTH RESOURCE STUDIES

**HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT**  
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, many people today are criticizing the Government for supporting the Nation's space program when so many domestic needs exist. And, indeed, there are many domestic problems which require solutions.

However 46 percent of our national budget already is allotted to domestic programs related to our human and physical resources, while only 1.4 percent is spent on space. What can we accomplish with 1.4 percent that we could not do with 46 percent?

So, rather than retard a program which has brought so many technical

and economic benefits to our country—why not use that program to help bring about the solutions to our needs on earth?

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, through its earth resources program, is working toward this end. Later this year, NASA will launch its first earth resources satellite. Next year, earth resources investigations will be a major assignment of the Skylab experimental space station.

The unmanned satellite and the manned Skylab will be devoted to refining the remote sensing techniques needed to gather information which will help us to better manage our physical resources.

To fully realize the immense potential of this program, however, one element is imperative—the space shuttle.

Once our earth resources system begins functioning, surveying our physical resources and the quality of our environment, there will be much work to be done in space.

If these observations are to be carried out by unmanned satellites, there will be a need for repairs—for replacement of batteries.

If manned space stations will be used in the observations, there will be a need for transportation of men and supplies from earth to the space stations and back.

Unless we are willing to continue paying the high cost of expendable spacecraft, the lowest, reusable space shuttle is the only vehicle which can meet these requirements.

As President Nixon said of the space shuttle:

It will take the astronomical costs out of astronautics. In short, it will go a long way toward delivering the rich benefits of practical space utilization and the valuable spin-offs from space efforts into the daily lives of Americans and all people.

#### FITZGERALD DENIED PUBLIC HEARING

**HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD**  
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues remember A. Ernest Fitzgerald, the Air Force efficiency expert who helped the Congress expose the huge overruns in the C-5A giant transport.

Ernie lost his job, because he was honest and because he testified before committees of the House and in the other body. His dismissal was termed by the Air Force part of a routine job reduction, but their heavy handedness was obvious.

Ernie now is in a new fight. This time with the Civil Service Commission. Fitzgerald's request is a simple one. He would like an open hearing before the Commission to get back pay and other benefits which are his due.

The Commission disagreed. But the court agreed with Fitzgerald that indeed he should be entitled to have his case heard before the press and the public. But

the Civil Service Commission has appealed that decision and currently that entire matter is in limbo while the court entertains the Commission's appeal.

Too much of what has happened to Ernie is the result of people acting in secret and behind closed doors. This man has earned a public hearing. He is the true patriot, not those who would seek to besmirch his name.

I introduce in the RECORD at this time an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and urge my colleagues to read it and familiarize themselves with the dilemma of A. Ernest Fitzgerald:

#### THE FITZGERALD CASE

When one reviews the case of A. Ernest Fitzgerald, it is difficult indeed to decide which has been the more mean-minded and self-serving, the Air Force or the Civil Service Commission. The Air Force, it is true, committed the initial injustice. But the Civil Service Commission has evaded a responsibility to rectify it.

Mr. Fitzgerald, it will be remembered, got into trouble in the fall of 1968 when Defense Department officials learned he had been called to testify before a Senate-House subcommittee on economy in government and intended to answer whatever questions he might be asked as frankly and fully as he could. He did just that. And, although he did not disclose anything that was classified and that was not already well known to numerous insiders, he did—in much the manner of the little boy who said that the emperor was unclothed—inform Senator Proxmire in reply to a question, that the cost of the Lockheed C-5A was running about two billion dollars above what the Air Force was supposed to pay for it.

You might suppose that this disclosure would have prompted the Air Force to check up on the efficiency of Lockheed's production and to reform its own procurement procedures. In fact, however, it prompted the Air Force only to confine Mr. Fitzgerald to trifling assignments and then, in the fall of 1969, to fire him on the pretext of a reduction in force. If there was a widespread supposition that this amounted to nothing but a reprisal, the Air Force has only itself to blame.

Mr. Fitzgerald then filed with the Civil Service Commission an appeal for reinstatement, back pay and other relief. He asked for an open and public hearing but, in the spring of 1971, was granted instead a hearing behind closed and locked doors. He went to the U.S. District Court with a request that the hearing be opened to the public and press. The court found that an open and public hearing was required and ordered the commission to grant it. Then, after prolonged delay, the commission took its case to the Court of Appeals where, more than two years after Mr. Fitzgerald's dismissal, it is now pending.

It is not terribly difficult to figure out why Mr. Fitzgerald would like a public hearing. Presumably he would like it because he would like to confront and cross-examine in the presence of reporters the motley collection of "witnesses" gathered by the Air Force to defame him. One of the "witnesses," cryptically identified as "T-1," stated—the quotation is taken from a document designated "for official use only"—that, in his opinion, "Fitzgerald is arrogant, untrustworthy and one who does not respect the Air Force. According to source, Fitzgerald is married, has three children, lives in a large home in McLean, Virginia, drives a Rambler automobile, and is a 'pinch penny' type of person."

Whether the source considers Mr. Fitzgerald a "pinch penny" because he is married, because he has three children, because he lives in a large home or because he drives a Rambler (what model Rambler?), we cannot say. We do not even know what T-1 looks like,

or whether he is personally a spend-thrift or a miser, whether he regards a two billion dollar cost overrun as a pittance or as an appreciable sum in terms of public money. We do not know, to tell the truth, whether T-1 should be referred to as Mr. T-1, Mrs. T-1, Miss T-1, or Ms. T-1, whether he or she or it is an employee of Lockheed, a disgruntled former associate of Mr. Fitzgerald, an expert in cost accounting or a dolt who supposes that respect for the Air Force is shown by helping to cover up its blunders. All these questions make it a cinch to figure out Mr. Fitzgerald's interest in publicity.

Why the Civil Service Commission wants to keep the proceedings secret is much harder to comprehend. Does it fear that the anonymous informers will seem seedy and disreputable? Is it trying to cover up for the Air Force, as the Air Force tried so long to cover up for Lockheed? The Civil Service Commission was originally established to put an end to the spoils system in government employment and to protect government employees from political reprisals and the rapacity of politically appointed administrators. The only reason given by the CSC for refusing the request for an open hearing is that it is "a long-established regulatory policy and practice of the commission" to hold such hearings in secret.

An open hearing in a matter of this kind is a right not alone of the individual Civil Service employee but more importantly, a right of the American public as well. It affords the best assurance—indeed, the only genuinely effective assurance—that due process will be observed and that justice will be done. That is, of course, precisely why the District Court ordered the CSC to hold its hearings in public. A closed hearing might be in order at the request of an individual as a means of protecting his reputation. Over his protest, it is an outrage. There has been far too much hush-hush and coverup about this disgraceful Fitzgerald affair already.

#### PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN NIXON

### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Austin American-Statesman. This editorial, I believe, offers a clear perspective of the confidence the American people have in President Nixon's ability to lead this country in both domestic and foreign policy. The editorial states:

The performance of President Nixon has been imaginative, energetic, dedicated, honest and productive.

It is our responsibility as elected representatives to listen to the people. The people, obviously, believe in Richard Nixon, his promises and his performance.

I enter the entire editorial for your consideration:

#### PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN NIXON

As recently as a year ago many political experts were predicting confidently that President Nixon would be a one-term chief executive because his programs were marking time while the economy worsened and while peace became more elusive with each passing day.

The case made against the administration was familiar. There was the usual doomsaying. Comparisons in hypothetical polls pitted the President against any one of some dozen

Democrat non-candidates and the conclusions were dire. The Republican party, it was said, was in disarray.

Strange then, is it not, that as the 1972 election period approaches many of the same political pundits are asking what happened? President Nixon clearly has strong party support. The same polls that were used as evidence against him only months ago are indicating that he has the confidence of the American people. Suddenly the domestic problems do not loom quite as large, and much of the world from Peking to Peoria seems to believe that peace may indeed be an attainable goal.

The answer is, of course, that nothing has happened that has not been happening for the last three years. Or, putting it another way, there are none so blind as those who will not see.

If there has been one political constant in the United States of America in recent years it is President Nixon. He is bringing the war in Vietnam to an honorable conclusion as he said he would do. He actively is seeking a generation of peace through unprecedented summit conferences with all of the major chiefs of state in the world.

All told, the performance of President Nixon has been imaginative, energetic, dedicated, honest and productive, considering the state of the nation, the world and Congress.

Is it any wonder that the Democrats are having a difficult time to find a candidate who can recapture the public confidence that now resides in the White House?

#### THE KEY TO THE FREE ENTERPRISE ECONOMY AND HOW TO CONTROL IT

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the clearest and most striking analyses I have ever seen of the critical economic problems besetting our country at this time and in recent years was submitted to me a few days ago by one of my constituents, J. A. Robinson of Costa Mesa, Calif. Mr. Robinson shows why the steady shift in Federal spending from capital goods manufacturing—primarily defense and aerospace—to welfare, payrolls, and bureaucratic services has a marked depressing effect on the economy, because it is a far less economically efficient use of the money. If his analysis is correct, our famous "reordering of priorities" in Government spending will not only critically weaken our national defense capability, as many of us have pointed out on this floor during the past year, but will work exactly contrary to its announced purpose of raising the living standards and improving the quality of life of the American people.

While not endorsing everything Mr. Robinson says about the desirability of using Federal spending to stimulate the economy independent of actual need for the programs on which the money is spent, I would recommend to the very careful attention of all of my colleagues his discussion of the "multiplier" effect of Federal spending on defense and aerospace by comparison with almost all Federal spending in the highly touted "hu-

man resources" programs which consist primarily of expensive payrolls, services of dubious and hard-to-measure value, and welfare handouts. According to Mr. Robinson, every dollar spent on aerospace multiplies itself by a factor of 3.5 in the economy, while each dollar spent on Government payrolls multiplies itself by a factor of only 1.25, and welfare dollars do not multiply at all.

The analysis follows:

#### THE KEY TO THE FREE ENTERPRISE ECONOMY AND HOW TO CONTROL IT

(By J. A. Robinson)

The key to the free enterprise economy is the multiplier. The economists have recognized for some time that the economy has a multiplier action in it, but they attribute the source of the multiplier to the Marginal Propensity to Consume schedule of  $\frac{2}{3}$ , and hence think that it is diffused throughout the economy.

The source of the multiplier is actually due to the presence in the economy of business investment capital. This capital provides a leveraging effect to the dollar. The value of the multiplier can be calculated for various industries and transactions, but the most significant are, welfare (0), payroll (1.25), and for the high technology capital goods manufacturing industry (3.5). The multiplier does not, of course, generate real dollars, only the Mint prints money, but it does generate economic dollars. Any time a dollar changes hands in return for a new capital good or service, it adds into the NNP. In the case of the high technology capital goods manufacturing industry, a dollar of sales attracts a dollar of investment, and generates an additional dollar and a half of Consumption spending.

The multiplier is both the blessing and the bane of the free enterprise economy. It works equally well in both directions and accounts for the Boom-or-Bust history of the economy. Although there is over 3 times as many Consumption dollars than Government dollars, they are very weak dollars. It is the Government dollar that controls the economy. The Government dollars are many, they can be shifted rapidly, and pinpointed accurately in the economy.

To see how this works in practice, let us see where the present economy really is and how it got there. To do this we will use 1967 as a reference, unemployment was only 3.5% and the Budget was reasonably balanced. With the best of intentions, and the reordering of priorities 15 billion dollars were taken out of defense procurement and 2 billion dollars out of the NASA budget, and transferred to Administration, Legislative, Civil Service, and Armed Forces payrolls and to other similar areas. The economists might have expected some temporary dislocations, but no major net effect on the economy, since the same number of Government dollars would be spent. With the multiplier varying with location in the economy, quite a different situation ensued. Shifting the 17 billion dollars from the 3.5 area to the 1.25 area generated a 38¼ billion dollar depressionary force in the economy. The economy dutifully started to slide to the new equilibrium level. Two million more people were laid off. The Full Employment Budget concept dictated deficit spending and 28 billion dollars of deficit spending was introduced. This deficit spending merely introduces a counterforce to keep the economy from sliding further. The depressionary force will remain in the economy for years, unless it is removed by fiscal measures.

This Administration is not the first to fall into this hitherto unknown trap, every recession or depression in modern times has resulted from attempts to reorder priorities without knowing about the shift in the multiplier.

This does not mean that priorities cannot be reordered, it just means that funding cannot be taken away from the high technology capital goods manufacturers without the economy taking a beating from the multiplier. The economy gained by the multiplier when this industry was built-up and would have to take its lumps if it tried to discontinue its support. Actually, this industry could be considered to be a perpetual motion money machine, any time that you can get 3½ dollars worth of action for 1 dollar, you want to maintain it.

The important thing to be aware of, is that the economy gains by the production of capital goods, not by the goods themselves. The fact that the goods are useful is only a bonus. The cost of a capital good is only the sum total of all the wages, salaries, interest, rent, retained earnings, dividends, and taxes, that went into it, right back to the man who mined the ore. When this capital good is delivered, all of the money is already in the economy. The industry only serves to transfer the Government dollars into the pockets of the people in the most effective manner from the standpoint of the economy. These dollars, when spent, will generate new economic dollars.

The tax dollar has three fundamental purposes: 1) To provide funds for normal governmental purposes. 2) To provide funds that can be returned to the people through the highly leveraged industries to stimulate the economy to full employment. 3) To provide a means of bleeding off inflationary pressure if the economy inadvertently becomes over-stimulated.

The economy is actually very straightforward and predictable when you know how it operates; unfortunately people have preconceived notions about it based on business and personal economics. The economy does not follow the same laws. If you were to ask the man in the street why the economy is so depressed, he would say, the cost of the Viet Nam war, the space flights, defense procurement, and Foreign Aid. Actually, all of these have contributed more through the multiplier, then they cost.

The multiplier, provided by business investment, is the secret of success of the free enterprise system. The communist system does not have the multiplier and may only grow slowly by brute force; and by necessity it must hold the income of the people to the bare minimum, in order to maximize growth of their economy. Business investment is the "Goose that Lays the Golden Eggs". The communists kill the goose.

Any time that the economy is operating at less than the potential NNP, there is an irrecoverable loss. The upper limit of the potential NNP is only limited by the Full Employment ceiling. This ceiling is between 2% and 2.5% unemployment. Stimulation beyond this level will normally result in dissipation of the money by inflation.

The Federal Budget is a mix of spending with various degrees of leverage. Any particular mix will produce a specific NNP and a given degree of unemployment. In the interest of maximizing NNP, the Federal Budget should be realigned to bring the economy up to the Full Employment ceiling.

If there is any idle plant capacity with corresponding unemployed manpower capable of manning these facilities, the industry should be stimulated with contracts, beginning with the most highly leveraged. When these are at, or approaching, full employment, other industries may be reviewed for stimulation, up to the Full Employment Ceiling.

We could supply the NATO forces with new aircraft and weapon systems. This would have the double benefit of stimulating our economy, while reducing the burden and risk to our Armed Forces.

Although, in the interest of maximizing

NNP in the shortest time requires contracts to produce existing hardware or R & D efforts, contracts should also be let for R & D efforts to develop instrumentation and equipment to clean up the ecology. These could come on-line when the necessity for the production of armaments is reduced.

The economy appears to have the capability of producing between 25 and 50 billion dollars a year of these high technology capital goods under the economic stimulation program. This will produce an increase of 87.5 to 175 billion dollars in the NNP.

The present inflationary trend is basically cost-push by union labor. Since the control of the economy is the Government dollar, not the Consumption dollar, the government may now wave the big-stick, taxes. Make it clear to the unions that inflationary wage settlements will not be tolerated, if they insist on them, that the government will take it away from them in taxes. A sop of 2% per year might be allowed in an industry that cannot increase productivity, just to make the workers feel that they are not stalemated.

#### THE ORIGINATION OF THE MULTIPLIER

The multiplier originates because of the presence in the economy of the investment dollar. The easiest way of explaining its origination is to use a numerical example. The Aerospace/Defense industries will be used as an example. The ratios used are based on data from Fortune's top 500 corporations and a typical Aerospace/Defense company.

To simplify the example, we will assume that the industry is operating at its normal maximum capacity. If the government established that it would require 60 million dollars worth of electronic widgets a year for a number of years, the industry would either establish a new widget factory or expand an existing one. Typically, this facility would require a capital investment of 30 million dollars, and also typically would have an annual payroll of 30 million dollars and a requirement for 30 million dollars of supplies and materials.

The prime subcontractors and suppliers in turn would have an aggregate requirement of a capital investment of 15 million dollars and an annual payroll of 15 million dollars and 15 million dollars of supplies and materials. This process would be repeated through successive tiers, each being reduced by ½. A series beginning with 1 and with each subsequent term ½ of the previous one, has a sum of 2.

When the system has run its course, the total capital investment will be 30 million dollars for the prime manufacturer and an aggregate investment of 30 million dollars by the suppliers and subcontractors. Similarly, the prime manufacturer will have a 30 million dollar payroll and the others an aggregate payroll of 30 million dollars.

The original 60 million dollars purchase has resulted in 60 million dollars of investment and 60 million dollars of payroll. After taxes, other withholdings, and savings the employees will have 40 million dollars for consumption spending and 15 million dollars will have gone back to the government in personal and corporate taxes.

The original 60 million dollars has already generated 160 million dollars of NNP. The 40 million dollars of consumption spending will be spent typically for unleveraged services, with some moderately leveraged purchases, and a small percentage for leveraged capital goods. The net result might be an additional 4 million dollars of invested capital and 54 million dollars of NNP.

At a net cost of 60 million dollars, less 15 million dollars of tax revenue, or 45 million dollars, the government has received 60 million dollars of capital goods and has generated 64 million of investment capital and 90 million dollars of consumption spending for a net gain of 214 million dollars to the

NNP. The same 60 million spent directly in the market place would only generate 6 million dollars of investment and 75 million dollars of consumption spending for a net gain of 141 million dollars to the NNP.

The capital goods sector of the economy provides the equivalent of recycling in ecology. Money, adjusted for tax receipts, passes through the capital goods sector generating investment and jobs, and departs it largely intact to be recycled elsewhere in the economy.

#### LEVERAGE OF THE CONSUMPTION SPENDING DOLLAR

The "power" of a dollar in the economy is a function of its ability to generate additional economic dollars. A dollar spent in the high technology capital goods manufacturing area will attract a dollar of investment capital, and generate a dollar and a half of additional Consumption spending, for a total leverage of 3.5.

The average Consumption spending dollar is a very weak one. Although there is a large quantity, 650 billion dollars, the average consumer is very restricted in what areas that he may spend his dollar. Typically, 65% will go for the necessities of life, food, shelter, and clothing.

Food is very poorly leveraged, it is a high volume, low mark-up, low investment to Sales ratio, type of operation. A dollar to the supermarket will only attract 12 cents of investment and generate 8 cents of Consumption spending by the employees. The suppliers to the supermarket are equally poorly leveraged.

Rent or house payments are particularly poorly leveraged. Effectively, the cost of the structure entered the economy when it was built, after this time the economy only recognizes an annual charge as a capital good being used up. This charge is much less than the payments or rent.

Clothing requires somewhat more Investment than food does, but it is still a high volume, low investment to Sales ratio business, and only accounts for about 10% of the consumers dollar.

The remainder of the dollar covers personal care, utilities, medical care, transportation, household goods, and recreation. The only items with significant leverage are household appliances and new automobiles.

As a result, the Consumption dollar, reduced by taxes, other withholdings, and savings, may be expected to have a multiplier of 1.75 based on Disposable Income, or 1.25 when referenced to the original dollar.

#### EXPANSIONARY AND CONTRACTIONARY PRESSURES IN THE ECONOMY

The origination of the multiplier was explained using the cash flow approach, in order to illustrate that there was no black-magic involved in the multiplier. NNP is only the inventory of the economy, an increase is not necessarily significant in itself. Business investment, although it provides the basis for the multiplier and is the keystone of the free enterprise system, is of little interest to the consumer. The thing of interest to the consumer is that a net spending of 45 million dollars by the government has resulted in 90 million dollars of income to the public, and 7800 new jobs.

To the businessman and to the economy a somewhat different picture emerges. The prime manufacturer has an increase in sales of 60 million dollars. His subcontractors and prime suppliers have increased sales of 30 million dollars. Their suppliers have increased sales, until when the system has run its course, an additional total of 60 million dollars of sales will be accumulated.

The original 60 million dollars a year requirement for capital goods by the government has had the following net positive effects in the economy. An increase of business investment of 64 million dollars, an increase in sales of 120 million dollars, an increase of

NNP by 214 million dollars, and an increase of 90 million dollars in consumption spending by the consumers in the public sector. These positive factors may be considered to have an expansionary force in the economy. The magnitude of the force is the 60 million dollars of increased sales of the prime manufacturer, the 60 million dollars of increased sales of his suppliers, and the 90 million dollars of increased consumption spending, or a total of 210 million dollars.

This expansionary force is close to the increase of NNP since they are derived from interrelated numbers. The two should not be confused however, the same increase of NNP could have been obtained by the government buying 214 million dollars of kangaroos from Australia, which would obviously not have the same effect on the economy.

Should the government cancel this contract, the same thing would happen in reverse and a depressionary force of 210 million dollars would be created.

These expansionary and depressionary forces enter the economy when the contract is signed or terminated. Over a period of time, these forces will be translated into an appropriate shift in the NNP, at which time all forces will have been dissipated and the economy will return to a state of stable equilibrium at its new level.

#### FISCAL 1972, THE FIRST STEP

In order to provide a foundation for the economic recovery budget of fiscal 1973, the following program should be implemented in the Spring of 1972. A 5 billion dollar program to be administered by NASA and DOD. This program would provide the funding required for the Aerospace/Defense industries to rehire up to 75% of the Scientists and Engineers that they have laid off since 1968, and to the extent that funding is available, up to 75% of the specialists and highly trained technicians. This would be about 56,000 Scientists and Engineers and about 144,000 others. The government would reimburse the companies for salaries, fringe benefits, burden, and up to 50% of related research and development costs. These people would work on research and development and preparation of proposals to the government for hardware and services. As contracts are let, the people would be transferred to the extent possible from this program to the company payroll. Additional people required would be hired directly by the company.

#### A PREDICTION

Besides the depressionary force in the economy, there is the very real psychological factor where neither business or the consumers feel that the government has control of the economy. The government and the economists have been announcing since early Fall of last year that the economy had turned the corner and was on the way up. Over a year later, the economy doesn't look any better to the consumer and to the businessman it looks worse, he now has inflationary pressure from labor and controls on prices and profits.

The Administration, by embarking on a bold, imaginative plan to restore full employment, and to use the present excess capacity of the Aerospace/Defense industries to combat environmental problems, will have a buoyant effect on consumer and business confidence. This increased confidence will cause the consumers to start spending their savings and induce businesses to take advantage of the Investment Tax Credit to expand. The effect of this increased confidence will lead the actual stimulation provided by the fiscal spending. The net result will be increasing optimism by the consumers and businesses for the future economy, beginning in the Spring and strengthening during the year.

### CONGRESSMAN DRINAN'S VOTING RECORD AND LEGISLATION SPONSORED, 92D CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

#### HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, through newsletters and otherwise, I have frequently reported to my constituents my position on key legislative matters before the Congress. During the first session of the 92d Congress 319 recorded votes and 151 quorum calls were taken in the House of Representatives. I believe my constituents have a right to know how I voted on each one of those issues, and I am therefore taking this opportunity to set forth very briefly and in plain language my position on every vote. The outcome of every vote is also set forth, as are the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD page references to statements I have made in Congress on key issues.

I have tried to attend every House session, and have been present for 94.7 percent of all votes. Occasionally, official business required me to be absent.

Following my voting record, I describe briefly some of the principal bills which I have sponsored in Congress.

I welcome comments or inquiries from any constituent on any vote I have taken. I would also be pleased to send to constituents on request a copy of any statement I have made in Congress.

The dates and my votes—"Y" indicating yes, "N" indicating no—are in parentheses:

#### JANUARY

ELECTION OF SPEAKER (21). I voted for Carl Albert, who defeated Gerald Ford 250-176. HOUSE RULES, HRes5(22). Motion to end debate on the "modified 21-day rule," to allow the Speaker to initiate floor action on bills stalled in the Rules Committee more than 21 days. (N) Y134,N254. Amendment to end debate on deletion of modified 21-day rule. (Y) Y213,N174. Amendment deleting modified 21-day rule. (N) Y234,N153. Final adoption of House Rules. (Y) Y226,N156.

#### FEBRUARY

ELECTION OF DEMOCRATIC HOUSE COMMITTEE MEMBERS, HRes193(4). Motion to end debate. (Not voting) Y259,N32.

#### MARCH

INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE, HRes264(2). I opposed this resolution which withheld production of a variety of documents and information involved in the *Stamler* lawsuit, which challenges the constitutionality of the Internal Security Committee and its predecessor, the Un-American Activities Committee. (N) Y292,N63.

DEBT CEILING, HR4690(3). Amendment to delete from the national debt bill a provision allowing the sale of \$10 billion in government bonds without regard to the 4¼% ceiling on interest the government can pay on such loans. (Y) 180,N212. Final passage of bill increasing the debt ceiling by \$35 billion to \$430 billion. (N) Y228,N162.

WAGE-PRICE CONTROL AUTHORIZATION, HR4246(10). Extending until March 31, 1973, the President's authority to control prices, rents, and wages. (Y) Y382,N19.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX, HR5432(10). Extending through March 31, 1973, this tax, which is designed to correct the balance-of-

payments deficit by reducing the flow of U.S. dollars to foreign countries. (Y) Y393,N5. DEBT CEILING AND SOCIAL SECURITY CONFERENCE REPORT, HR4690(16). To increase debt limit to \$430 billion and provide 10% across-the-board increase in Social Security benefits. (Y) Y360,N3. My statement regarding this bill is at page E2981 of the April 7 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS, HJRes465(16). Appropriating \$50.6 million for unemployment compensation payments to ex-servicemen and Federal employees. (Y) Y355,N0.

SST, HJRes468(18). Two votes to prohibit funds for supersonic transport development. (Y) Y216,N203; (Y) Y217,N204.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO LOWER VOTING AGE TO 18, HJRes223(23). (Y) Y401,N19.

RURAL TELEPHONE BANK, HR7(24). Motion limiting debate. (Y) Y366,N26. Final passage of bill to create a \$300 million government investment program for rural telephone companies. (N) Y269,N127.

WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS, SJRes55(29). To limit debate on resolution extending laws regarding interest rates and wage-price controls. (Y) Y324,N6. Amendment to limit the President's wage-price authority to require that controls be used only on a broad basis, not limited to a small segment of the economy. (Y) Y143,N183.

DRAFT SYSTEM EXTENSION, HR6531(31). Harrington amendment to end the draft on June 30, 1971. (Y) Y62,N331. My statement in support of the Harrington amendment is at page H2239 of the March 31 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Whalen amendment to extend draft one year only. (Y) Y198,N200.

#### APRIL

DRAFT SYSTEM EXTENSION, HR6531(1). Amendment to retain the two-year term of alternate service for conscientious objectors instead of the three-year term proposed. (Y) Y132,N242. Amendment to prohibit compelled assignment of draftees to Southeast Asia after 1971. (Y) Y122,N260. Amendment to prohibit use of draftees in an undeclared war. (Y) Y96,N278. Amendment to reduce draft extension from two years to 18 months. (Y) Y170,N200. Final passage of bill extending draft for two years. (N) Y293,N99.

SUGAR BEET SUBSIDY, HRes356(6). Motion to debate granting subsidies to sugar beet growers. (Y) Y182,N177. Motion to not authorize subsidies. (Y) Y193,N115.

EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS, HR7016(7). Hathaway amendment to increase funding by \$728.6 million for educational programs. (Y) Y188,N191. Conte amendment to delete provision forbidding any busing of school children to achieve integration. (Y) Y149,N206. Final passage of the bill to provide \$4.8 billion for the Office of Education and related agencies for fiscal 1972. (Y) Y355,N7.

IMMIGRATION—LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT, HR1535(19). To exempt aliens from English-language literacy requirements for naturalization if they are 50 or older and have lived in the United States at least 20 years. Although unable to vote on this measure, I completely support it, and am pleased it passed by a vote of 192-84.

MARITIME AUTHORIZATION, HR4724(20). Authorizing \$507.6 million for fiscal 1972 maritime programs of the Commerce Department. (Y) Y360,N11.

PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS, HR5376(22). On motion to delete the accelerated public works provisions. (N) Y128,N262. Final passage of bill to extend economic development programs, and to accelerate public works projects. I vigorously supported this measure, which would have had a positive influence on our lagging economy, and was deeply distressed when it was vetoed by President Nixon. (Y) Y319,N68. My statement in support of the bill is at page H2795 of the April 21 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

D.C. POLICE DOGS, HR2598(27). Motion to return to Committee for further consideration a bill authorizing maintenance of police dogs for the District of Columbia. (Y) Y76,N303. D.C. LIQUOR LICENSES, HR6417(27). To reduce the number of licenses for retail liquor sale in D.C. (N) Y178,N200.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BENEFITS, HR6444(28). To provide a 10% increase in railroad retirement benefits. (Y) Y379,N0.

INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE FUNDS, HRes 274(29). Amendment to increase the Committee's annual funding from the \$450,000 recommended by the House Administration Committee to \$570,000. (N) Y257, N129. Motion to instruct the House Administration Committee to hold public hearings on Internal Security Committee's need for funds. (Y) Y104,N275. Passage of \$570,000 appropriation for the Committee for 1971. (N) Y300, N75. My statement opposing the HISC funds is at page H3210 of the April 29 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### MAY

REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH, HR6283 (3). To extend to April 1, 1973, the President's authority to submit to Congress plans to reorganize the executive branch. (Y) Y301, N20.

PASSPORT APPLICATIONS, S531(4). To allow postal officials to process passport applications. (Y) Y241,N124.

TRUMAN BIRTHDAY, HRes422(5). Saluting former President Truman on his 87th birthday. (Y) Y380,N0.

SBA LENDING CEILING, HR4604(5). To consider bill to increase ceiling on Small Business loans outstanding at any one time from \$2.2 billion to \$3.1 billion. (Y) Y381,N0. Final passage. (Y) Y383,N0.

COMMITTEE EXPENSES, HRes412(6). To allow travel funds for members of Education and Labor Committee. (Not voting) Y156,N172.

D.C. FIREMEN, HR5386(10). Extending criminal penalties for assault on D.C. firemen. (Not voting) Y312,N0.

D.C. SUBWAY, HR8190(11). Amendment to fund further the D.C. subway currently under construction. (Y) Y170,N219.

SST, HR8190(12). Two amendments, each to provide \$85.3 million for SST development, including construction of two prototypes. (N) Y201,N195; (N) Y201,N197.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION, HR7271(17). To authorize appropriations for Civil Rights Commission programs at an annual rate of \$4 million until January 31, 1973. (Y) Y262,N67.

SCHOOL LUNCHES, HR5257(17). To authorize Agriculture Department to spend \$150 million in fiscal 1971 and 1972 for free and reduced-price lunches for needy children. (Y) Y332,N0.

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA, HR56(17). Establishing a national environmental data system under the Council on Environmental Quality. (Y) Y305,N18.

SHOOTING ANIMALS, HR5060(17). Providing criminal penalties for unlicensed shooting from aircraft of certain animals. (Y) Y307,N8.

OCEANS, ATMOSPHERE COMMITTEE, HR2587 (17). To establish a national committee to advise the Federal government on problems affecting the oceans and atmosphere. (Y) Y293,N10.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT, HRes437(18). Motion to vote on a bill to provide public-service jobs during periods of high unemployment. (Y) Y182,N210. To permit consideration of an Administration-backed substitute to the emergency employment bill. (Not voting) Y210,N177. Providing for a procedure to consider the emergency employment bill. (Y) Y350,N34.

RAILROAD STRIKE, SJRes100(18). To prevent a strike by railroad employees, extend bargaining time through October 1, and provide a pay increase for signalmen. (Y) Y265,N93.

SST—SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT, HR8190(20). To provide \$7.02 billion in additional funds for Federal agen-

cies for fiscal 1971 (including SST funds). (N) Y234,N28. To accept the Senate's proposed \$155.8 million in funding for SST program termination. (N) Y118,N156. (By voice vote, the House voted \$97.3 million for SST termination. I voted no.)

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE, HRes415(24). Authorizing the Committee to travel and conduct studies. (Y) Y201,N88. ACTION VOLUNTEER AGENCY, HRes411(25). Resolution to disapprove the Administration's plan to submerge the Peace Corps, VISTA and other volunteer agencies into one agency. (Y) Y131,N224. My statement on this issue is at page H4309 of the May 25 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ENERGY RESOURCES, HRes155(26). To create a Select House Committee on Energy Resources to consider oil, gas, electricity and other energy problems. (Y) Y128,N218.

#### JUNE

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT, HR3613(2). Motion to defeat the emergency public-service employment bill, which would create jobs at all levels of government, and replace it with an Administration proposal to share some Federal manpower funds with the states. (N) Y182,N204. On second vote I again voted not to defeat the emergency public-service employment bill. (N) Y184,N202. Although detained by official business I was pleased that the bill passed 245-141.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, HRes452(3). To allow debate on NSF authorization bill. (Y) Y357,N4.

NASA, HR7109(3). Authorizing \$3.4 billion for fiscal 1972 NASA activities. (Y) Y303,N64.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS, HR8825(4). Appropriating funds for fiscal 1972 operations of legislative branch. (Not voting) Y259,N26.

EXTENSION OF AID TO HANDICAPPED, HR8011 (7). Extending laws authorizing government procurement of items produced by the handicapped. (Not voting) Y309,N0.

DOMESTIC WINE PRODUCTION, HR 1161(7). Removing restrictions on promotion of domestic wines overseas. (Not voting) Y298,N13. NSF, HR7960(7). Authorizing fiscal 1972 NSF operations (Not voting) Y319,N8.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, HRes465 (8). To debate extending until September 30, 1973, the provisions of the Agreement. (Y) Y336,N41.

MICRONESIAN CLAIMS, HJRes617(9). Amendment to require that Japanese contribution to Micronesian Claims Commission be in cash rather than goods and services. (N) Y166,N215. Final passage of bill to pay non-combat claims of certain residents of Micronesia. (Y) Y225,N158.

SUGAR ACT, HR8866(10). Motion to forbid any amendments in the course of the debate on the Sugar Act extension (N) Y213,N166. On final passage, I voted not to extend the Sugar Act for three years, in view of its provisions for imports from the racist government of South Africa. (N) Y229,N128.

D.C. POLICE AND FIREMEN, HR 8794(14). Providing disability payments. (Not voting) Y311,N1.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT, S575(15) Conference report on bill to extend Appalachian regional development program and authorize public work projects in areas of high unemployment. (Y) Y275,N104.

MILITARY FUNDS—INCLUDING ABM, B-1 BOMBER AND MILITARY R&D, HR8687(16). Amendment to prohibit \$102 million in anti-ballistic missile system funding. (Y) Y129,N267.

Amendment to delete \$370.3 million for development of the B-1 bomber. (Y) Y97,N307. Amendment to increase fiscal 1972 military research and development funds by no more than 5% over 1971 level. (Y) Y135,N258.

Amendment to limit fiscal 1972 military procurement authorization to 1971 level. (Y) Y118,N279. My statement with respect to weapons programs and the Defense Dept. budget is at page H1181 of the November 17 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT, (17). Rep. McCloskey moved to adjourn, and thus temporarily terminate debate on the military procurement bill. I voted "present". Y30,N369.

EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS, HR7016(17). Motion to table, and thus defeat, motion to instruct House members of the House-Senate Conference to accept Senate amendments to the fiscal 1972 education appropriations bill. (N) Y228,N182.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT—INDOCHINA WAR FUNDS, HR8687(17). Mink amendment to bar use of military procurement funds in or over Indochina after December 31, 1971. (Y) Y82, N327. Nedzi-Whalen amendment to bar use of military procurement funds in or over Indochina after December 31, 1971, or some other date in fiscal 1972 recommended by the President (Y) Y158,N255. My statement supporting the Nedzi-Whalen amendment is at page H5381 of the June 17 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Amendment to bar use of funds in Indochina after June 1, 1972, subject to release of all prisoners of war. (Y) Y147,N237. Final passage of bill to authorize \$21.06 billion for fiscal 1972 military procurement. (N) Y331,N58.

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, HRes434 (18). Authorizing Committee to conduct investigations overseas. (Not voting) Y183, N119.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS, STUDENT LOANS, HR7736 (18). To extend health professions student scholarship program for one year. (Not voting) Y299,N0.

INVENTORS' CERTIFICATES, HR5237(21). Providing that inventors' certificates filed in foreign countries shall be treated in U.S. with the same priority as patent applications. (Y) Y340,N8.

U.S. BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION, S1538(21). Authorizing \$670,000. (Y) Y336,N24.

NATIONAL FORESTS, HR3146(21). To authorize Federal-state-local law enforcement cooperation regarding National Forests. (Y) Y361, N2.

H.R. 1—SOCIAL SECURITY, WELFARE REFORM, (21). Motion for closed rule allowing only one amendment in the course of the debate on the entire Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and welfare reform bill. (N) Y200, N172. Amendment to strike the family assistance welfare section of the bill. (N) Y187, N234. Final passage of bill to increase Social Security benefits and institute the FAP family assistance welfare reform plan. (Y) Y288, N132.

FARM SUBSIDIES, HR9270 (23). Conte amendment to reduce the limit on farm subsidy payments for any one producer from \$55,000 to \$20,000 per crop. (Y) Y214,N198.

STREAM CHANNELIZING, HR9270(23). Amendment to forbid funding of Agriculture Department stream channelizing projects. Stream channelizing construction projects degrade the countryside and are strongly opposed by conservationists. (Y) Y129,N278. My statement on this issue is at page H5795 of the June 23 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FOOD STAMPS FOR STRIKERS, HR9270(23). Amendment forbidding sale of food stamps to households needing assistance because a family member is on strike. (N) Y172,N225.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION, HR9272 (24). Amendment to pay \$11 million in U.S. obligations to the ILO. (Y) Y147, N227. My statement regarding the ILO is at page H5864 of the June 24 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE, HR9272 (24). Amendment to decrease by \$4.25 million funds for the Justice Department's Community Relations Service. (N) N127, Y233.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, HR 9272(24). Final passage of bill appropriating \$3.68 billion for the foregoing and related Federal agencies, and the courts. (Y) Y337, N10.

INDOCHINA WAR TERMINATION, HR6351(28). Motion to table, and thus defeat, a motion

to instruct House conferees on the draft extension bill to agree to a Senate amendment calling for withdrawal from Vietnam of all U.S. troops within 9 months of bill's enactment, subject to release of all prisoners of war. (N) Y219,N175. My statement on this issue is at page H5930 of the June 28 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

POSTAL SERVICE, TREASURY APPROPRIATIONS, HR 9271(28). Appropriating funds for Postal Service, Treasury and executive-branch offices for fiscal 1972. (Not voting) Y380,N6.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, HR 9417(29). Appropriating \$2.15 billion for fiscal 1972 operations of Interior Department and related agencies. (Y) Y400,N5.

PENTAGON PAPERS, HRes489(30). Motion to table, and thus defeat, a resolution directing the President to transmit to the House the text of the Pentagon Papers. (N) Y272,N113. EDUCATION FUNDS CONFERENCE REPORT, HR 7016(30). On agreement to Office of Education \$5.14 billion fiscal 1972 funds conference report. (Y) Y376,N15.

HUD—COUNSELLING SERVICES, HR9382(30). Amendment to strike from the fiscal 1972 Dept. of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill \$3 million for FHA counseling services. (N) Y164,N217.

#### JULY

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT, S31(1). Conference Report on bill authorizing Federal funds for state and local public-service jobs during periods of and in areas of high unemployment. (Y) Y343,N14.

HEALTH MANPOWER, HR8629(1). To extend and expand Federal aid for health professions manpower. (Y) Y343,N3.

NURSE TRAINING, HR8630(1). To extend for 3 years Federal programs to train nurses. (Y) Y324,N0.

LAOS, HRes492(7). Motion to table, and thus defeat, resolution directing Secretary of State to furnish to Congress documents regarding U.S. military operations in Laos. (N) Y261,N118.

OBSCENE MATERIAL, HR8805(7). Although I am opposed to the unsolicited mailing of offensive materials, I voted against this proposal to prohibit mail delivery of obscene matter because the bill was vague and provided no clear or enforceable standards upon which postal officials or others could base their conduct. (N) Y356,N25.

EXPORT BANK, HR8181(8). Amendment deleting language permitting the Export-Import Bank, with the President's approval, to finance exports to Communist countries. (N) Y207,N153. Motion to remove Export-Import Bank transactions from the Federal administrative budget. (N) Y112,N249.

WATER DESALTING, HR9093(8). Authorizing expansion of Interior Dept. sea-water desalting program. (Y) Y325,N0.

D.C. TEACHERS, HR8407(12). Authorizing District of Columbia government to enter into an interstate teacher qualification pact. (Y) Y325,N4.

CHIEF JUSTICE, HR8699(13). To provide an administrative assistant for the Chief Justice of the United States. (Y) Y263,N139.

CBS CONTEMPT CITATION, HRes 534(13). I supported the motion to send back to committee, and thus defeat, a proposed contempt of Congress citation of CBS and its President, Dr. Frank Stanton, arising out of "The Selling of the Pentagon" program. (Y) Y226,N181.

TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, HR9667(14). Appropriating \$2.73 billion for fiscal 1972 operations of Transportation Dept., Civil Aeronautics Board, Interstate Commerce Commission, and related agencies. (Y) Y401,N12.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION FUNDS, HR9388(15). Amendment deleting \$3.5 million for atomic waste project near Lyons, Kansas. (Y) Y162,N207.

MILITARY DRUG TREATMENT, HR9265(19). Authorizing VA drug treatment and rehabilitation programs. (Y) Y379,N0.

VETERANS MEDICAL ASSISTANCE, HJRes748(19). Authorizing improvement and establishment of medical schools affiliated with VA. (Y) Y371,N2.

BETHUNE MEMORIAL, SJRes111(19). To authorize construction of memorial in Washington, D.C., to Mary Bethune, a prominent black educator. (Y) Y289,N89.

JOINT ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE, HRes424(20). To establish a Joint House-Senate Committee on the Environment. (Y) Y372,N18.

HOUSE OFFICE ALLOWANCES, HRes457(21). To allow the House Administration Committee, rather than the full House of Representatives, to set allowances for expenses of Congressmen's offices. (Y) Y233,N167.

BUS WIDTH LIMIT, HR4354(21). Motion to return to the Public Works Committee a bill to increase the width limitations of buses which travel on interstate highways. (N) Y178,N213.

HOUSE PROCEDURE, HRes533(22). To dispense with a quorum call. (Y) Y371,N5.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, HR9844(22). Authorizing \$2.1 billion, including \$918 million for housing families of military personnel. (Y) Y359,N31.

ENVIRONMENT, CONSUMER PROTECTION, AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, HR9270(27). Conference report on bill appropriating \$13.27 billion for the Department of Agriculture, environmental assistance, and consumer-protection programs for fiscal 1972. (Y) Y230,N162.

SACB, HR9272(27). To table, and thus defeat, a proposal to instruct House conferees to forbid the discredited Subversive Activities Control Board to spend funds to create a list of allegedly un-American organizations. (N) Y246,N141. My statement on this issue is at page H7183 of the July 27 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HEW-LABOR FUNDS, HR10061(27). Amendment to add \$230 million for HEW health and hospital programs. (Y) Y169,N215. Amendment to add \$82.4 million for HEW vocational rehabilitation programs. (Y) Y236,N153. Amendment to add \$64 million to HEW child welfare services. (Y) Y185,N201. Final passage of bill to appropriate \$20.46 billion in fiscal 1972 for Depts. of Labor and HEW. (Y) Y372,N25.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, HR9092(28). Amendment to exclude Federal employees not paid from appropriated funds from Federal comparability pay scales. (N) Y147,N232.

APPALACHIA, HR9922(28). To extend Appalachian Regional Commission and Commerce Dept. economic development programs. (Y) Y376,N27.

HUD, NASA, NSF, VA FUNDS, HR9382(29). Conference report on bill authorizing \$18.33 billion in fiscal 1972 funds for these and related agencies. (Y) Y363,N30.

TRANSPORTATION, ICC, CAB, FUNDS, INCLUDING SST, HR9667(29). Appropriating \$8.15 billion in fiscal 1972 funds for these and related agencies. (Y) Y393,N15. Amendment adding \$58.5 million to Transportation Dept. funds to repay airlines for costs of developing SST. (N) Y307,N99.

AEC, PUBLIC WORKS—AMCHITKA—NUCLEAR TESTS—DICKEY-LINCOLN, HR10090(29). To forbid use of Atomic Energy Commission funds for any nuclear testing in Aleutian Islands, Alaska. (Y) Y108,N275. My statement opposing the Amchitka test is at page H6789 of the July 15 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Amendment to strike from the AEC appropriations bill advanced planning funds for the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project in Maine. (N) Y199,N181. Final passage of bill appropriating fiscal 1972 funds for the AEC and a variety of public works projects. (Y) Y386,N4.

LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT, HR8432(30). The debate on the proposal to authorize \$250 million in government-guaranteed loans to Lockheed began with a stalling vote to approve the House journal. (Y) Y374,N10. Next, the House agreed to adjourn on August 6. (Y) Y334,N41. The House then agreed to consider the bill. (N) Y325,N68. There followed an amendment to decrease the portion of the loan which may be guaranteed by the government from 100% to 90%. (Y) Y176,N205. I opposed the bill on final passage but it carried by three votes. (N) Y192,N189.

#### AUGUST

DEPTS. OF STATE, JUSTICE AND COMMERCE AND JUDICIARY CONFERENCE REPORT, HR9272(2). Appropriating \$4.06 billion in fiscal 1972 funds for the foregoing and related agencies. I voted against this bill for a number of reasons, including its deletion of funds our government is legally obligated to pay to the International Labor Organization. (N) Y337,N35.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION, HRes539(2). Motion to discharge, and thus prevent further consideration by, the Education and Labor Committee of a resolution compelling the Secretary of HEW to submit data listing school districts receiving Federal funds to bus students. (N) Y252,N129. On final passage of resolution seeking HEW busing data. (Y) Y351,N36.

MARRIED WOMEN, HR3628(2). To give married women who are Federal employees benefits equal to those allowed married men. (Y) Y377,N11.

HOSPITALS, HConRes370(2). Resolution requiring that certain Public Health Services Hospitals remain open. (Y) Y370,N4.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, HJRes829(2). Providing ongoing funds for agencies whose fiscal 1972 appropriations had not been signed into law. (Y) Y350,N6.

FOREIGN AID, HR9910(3). To authorize \$3.44 billion in fiscal 1972 and \$3.49 billion in fiscal 1973 for foreign assistance programs. (Y) Y202,N192.

DRAFT EXTENSION CONFERENCE REPORT, HR 6531(4). I continue to believe, in accordance with the recommendation of the blue-ribbon Gates Commission, that the draft system should be replaced by a volunteer force. To consider bill extending the draft for two years. (N) Y250,N150. To return the bill to the Conference Committee. (Y) Y131,N273. Final passage of draft extension. (N) Y298,N108.

PUBLIC SERVICE JOBS, HJRes 833(4). Amendment to compute the funds distribution formula solely on the ratio of the number of unemployed in each state to the total of unemployed in nation (present formula also considers the level of unemployment in each state). (N) Y172,N213. Amendment to prohibit an agency from acting as a funds distribution conduit if the agency is applying for its own public-service jobs program. (Y) Y171,N219. Final passage of resolution for funds to operate public-service jobs program in fiscal 1972. (Y) Y321,N76.

EXPORT BANK CONFERENCE REPORT, S581(5). Broadening the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank. (Y) Y219,N140.

HEW, LABOR DEPTS. CONFERENCE REPORT, HR 10061(5). Appropriating \$20.8 billion in fiscal 1972 funds. (Y) Y280,N56.

#### SEPTEMBER

OCEAN DUMPING, HR9727(9). Although unable to be on the floor for the vote, I am recorded as supporting this bill establishing controls over the dumping of waste materials in the ocean and establishing a marine sanctuaries program. Y305,N3.

EMERGENCY DETENTION CAMPS, HR234(13-14). I was the only Member of Congress voting as a member of both Committees, Judiciary and Internal Security, which recommended legislation regarding the infamous detention camp law used to imprison without trial

Japanese-Americans during World War II. Judiciary recommended abolishment of the detention camp law; Internal Security recommended modification of the law. I agreed with my colleagues in Judiciary. On motion to debate the bills. (Y) Y345,N1. On Internal Security bill, which would retain detention camp law. (N) Y124,N272. On Judiciary bill to forbid detention camps without Congressional authorization. (Y) Y290,N111. On final passage of Judiciary bill. (Y) Y356,N49. My statements on this issue are at pages H8395 and H8397 of the September 14 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT, HR1746(16). Two votes to deny authorization of cease-and-desist powers to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (N) Y200,N195; (N) Y202, N197. Motion to return the EEOC bill to Committee. (Y) Y130,N270. Final passage of the bill—granting restricted powers to EEOC. (N) Y285,N106. My statement regarding this bill is at page H8475 of the September 15 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AEC, PUBLIC WORKS CONFERENCE REPORT, HR10090(22). Appropriating fiscal 1972 funds for public works projects and the AEC. (Y) Y377,N9.

PEACE CORPS, HR9166(23). Amendment to cut the Peace Corps fiscal 1972 authorization by \$27 million, from \$77.2 to \$50.2 million. (N) Y113,N232.

OEO-CHILD DEVELOPMENT ACT, HR10351(30). I strongly supported this bill, which would have extended OEO programs, and established voluntary child development programs and an independent legal services corporation, and was deeply distressed when President Nixon vetoed it in December. Amendment to reduce from 100,000 to 10,000 the population required for cities to receive child development funds. (Y) Y226,N158. Amendment to reduce from \$6,960 to \$4,320 the maximum income level for free day-care service. (N) Y187,N189. Amendment to include child development act in the bill. (Y) Y203,N181. Amendment requiring that 4% of community action programs go to Puerto Rico, Guam and Micronesia. (Y) Y202,N161. Amendment to eliminate legal services program. (N) Y152,N210. Second amendment to include child development programs in the bill. (Y) Y186,N183. Motion to instruct the Education and Labor Committee to report a bill reducing from \$6,960 to \$4,320 the maximum income level for families receiving free day-care service. (N) Y191,N180. Final passage. (Y) Y251,N115. My statement opposing the President's veto of this bill is at page E13422 of the December 14 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

#### OCTOBER

FEDERAL PAY RAISE, HRes596(4). Motion to defer consideration of Federal employees' pay raise. (Y) Y175,N198. Resolution disapproving the President's proposal postponing for six months a statutorily-approved pay increase for Federal employees. (Y) Y174,N207. PRISONERS OF WAR, HConRes 374(4). Calling for humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war held in Indochina. (Y) Y371,N0.

CREDIT UNION INSURANCE, HR9961(4). To provide temporary insurance for certain Federal credit unions. (Y) Y197,N122.\*

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS, HR8083(4). To require certain qualifications for air traffic controllers. (Y) Y294,N0.

SUGAR ACT CONFERENCE REPORT, HR8866(4). I again voted against extending the Sugar Act because of its provision for a quota for the racist government of South Africa. (N) Y194,N92.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS, HRes915(6). Providing \$270.5 million for unemployment benefits for ex-servicemen, former Federal employees, and workers adversely affected by imports. (Y) Y394,N9.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, HJRes916(6). Funds for agencies whose 1972 appropriations

had not yet been signed into law. (Y) Y387, N12.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN AND MEN, HJRes 208(12). I very strongly supported the proposed amendment to guarantee equal constitutional rights to men and women. On amendment specifying rights of non-citizens. (N) Y104,N254. On weakening amendment to legitimize discrimination against women under laws which allegedly "promote health and safety." (N) Y87,N265. On final passage of constitutional amendment that "equality . . . shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of sex." (Y) Y354,N24. My statement on equal rights of men and women is at page H9373 of the October 12 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CONSUMER PROTECTION AGENCY, HR10835(14). Amendment restricting the new Federal Consumer Agency's authority to intervene in lawsuits, or proceedings of other agencies. (N) Y149,N240. Amendment to allow the Consumer Agency to intervene in lawsuits, and proceedings of other agencies. (Y) Y160,N218. Final passage of bill establishing an independent Consumer Protection Agency and a White House Office of Consumer Affairs. (Y) Y345,N44. My statement in support of the new consumer agency is at page H9495 of the October 13 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY BENEFITS, HR9212(18). To give benefits to orphans whose fathers died of black lung disease, which afflicts coal miners. (Y) Y227,N124.

SCHOOL LUNCHES, HJRes923(18). To ensure that every eligible child receive a free or reduced-price lunch as required by the School Lunch Act. (Y) Y354,N0.

ANIMAL DISEASE, HR10458(18). Authorizing U.S. involvement in Western Hemisphere cooperation to combat livestock and poultry disease. (Y) Y342,N0.

PORT SAFETY, HR8140(18). Promoting safety of ports and waterways. (Y) Y336,N1.

INDOCHINA WAR TERMINATION, HR8687(19). Hebert motion to block any effort to vote on the Mansfield end-of-the-war amendment to the military procurement bill. (N) Y215, N193. Arends motion to instruct House conferees not to accept Mansfield amendment. (N) Y192,N216. Unfortunately, the House conferees refused to accept the Mansfield amendment notwithstanding rejection of the Arends motion. My statement in support of the Mansfield amendment is at page H9723 of the October 19 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION CONFERENCE REPORT, HR9844(20) (See July 22 vote). (Y) Y371, N26.

ALASKAN NATIVE CLAIMS, HR10367(20). The natives of Alaska have been attempting for many years to obtain back from the government land which belongs to them. I supported them. Amendment to establish a Commission to set aside wildlife and conservation areas in Alaska. (Y) Y178,N217. Passage of bill to grant natives 40 million acres of land, cash, and certain mineral rights in settlement of their claims. (Y) Y334,N63. ARMED SERVICES SURVIVOR BENEFITS, HR10670 (21). Establishing a survivor benefit plan for retired career military personnel. (Y) Y372,N0. GUAM, VIRGIN ISLANDS DELEGATES, HRes624 (21). To consider providing non-voting delegates to Congress from Guam and the Virgin Islands. (Y) Y280,N63.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, HR 11418(27). To appropriate \$2.01 billion for previously-authorized construction, including family housing and anti-pollution projects. (Y) Y354,N32.

HIGHER EDUCATION, HR7248(27). Motion to debate the 1971 Higher Education Act. (Y) Y371,N7. Amendment to allocate Federal grants for college students according to national eligibility scale rather than through state allotments. (N) Y117,N257. Amendment to allocate college grant funds to the states

in proportion to the national total of eligible students. (Y) Y108,N220.

#### NOVEMBER

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION, HR2266(1). Emergency School Aid Act granting Federal assistance to schools for desegregation. (Y) Y135,N222.

CREDIT UNION INSURANCE, HR9961(1). Providing insurance to federal credit unions. (Y) Y350,N0.

PRISON DRUG TREATMENT, HR8389(1). Requiring that states must make drug rehabilitation programs available to prisoners and ex-prisoners in order to receive Law Enforcement Assistance funds. (Y) Y350,N2.

MAGISTRATES, HR9180(1). Authorizing emergency reassignment of U.S. court magistrates. (Y) Y344,N10.

METHADONE, HR9323(1). To amend Federal law to permit methadone treatment of heroin addicts. (Y) Y354,N0.

LAND RECLAMATION, HR7854(1). To increase the authorization for small reclamation (e.g., irrigation) projects of the Interior Dept. (Y) Y346,N7.

FARM CREDIT, HR11232(1). To revise the authority of farmer-owned cooperatives for loans to rural residents (Y) Y331,N19.

ADJOURNMENT, (1-2) To consume time, adjournment motions were made November 1 and 2. I opposed both. (N) Y51,N255; (N) Y8,N286.

MILITARY MEDICINE, HR2(3). Establishing a Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences to attract physicians and dentists to military careers. Amendment requiring that University be within 25 miles of D.C. (N) Y148,N215. Final passage (Y) Y352,N31.

HIGHER EDUCATION, HR7248(3-4). The Higher Education Act was considered November 3 and 4. In an atmosphere of heated controversy, the House debated through the night of November 4, finishing at 2:30 a.m. November 5. 17 recorded votes were taken: Amendment to eliminate general aid to all institutions of higher learning (hereafter referred to as colleges). (N) Y84,N310. Amendment requiring colleges to maintain previous student aid levels. (Y) Y210,N182. Amendment to terminate aid to church-related colleges which is held unconstitutional. I opposed this amendment because it added nothing to existing law. (N) Y119,N264. Amendment to eliminate program of student internships with public officials. (N) Y229, N149. Amendment exempting undergraduate admissions from bill's prohibition of discrimination against women. (N) Y194,N189. Amendment extending land grant benefits to Guam and Virgin Islands colleges. (Y) Y220,N158. Amendment establishing National Institute of Education in HEW. (Y) Y210,N153. Amendment to delete funds for ethnic heritage studies. (Not voting) Y200, N159. Amendment denying to HEW authority to set standards for youth camp safety. (N) Y184,N166. Amendment postponing any busing of students required by law until every court appeal has been exhausted. (N) Y235, N125. Amendment forbidding any Federal employee from urging state or local officials to use local funds for busing. (N) Y231,N126. Amendment to exclude from busing prohibition school systems under court orders. (Y) Y146,N216. Ashbrook amendment prohibiting use of funds for busing students to desegregate schools under any circumstances. (N) Y234,N124. Amendment seeking report on need for funds to integrate public schools. (N) Y92,N269. Amendment adding the Emergency School Aid Act. (See November 1 entry) authorizing \$500 million in fiscal 1972 and \$1 billion in fiscal 1973 for assistance in desegregating public schools. (Y) Y211,N159. Second amendment to exclude undergraduate admissions from bill's prohibition of discrimination against women. (N) Y186,N181. Final passage of bill extending Federal aid to colleges and students, creating a National Institute of Education and authorizing desegregation funds. (Y) Y332,N38.

COFFEE AGREEMENT, HR8293(5). Extending President's authority to implement International Coffee Agreement. (N) Y200,N100. SCHOOL PRAYER, HJRes191(8). I opposed this proposal to dilute the Bill of Rights for the first time in American history and to authorize so-called "non-denominational" prayer in public buildings. After one day's debate, the House rejected the proposed amendment, less than the required two-thirds of those voting having supported it. On motion discharging the bill from the Judiciary Committee. (N) Y242,N156.\* On passage. (N) Y240,N163.\* My statement on this issue is at page H10602 of the November 8 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PESTICIDES, HR10729(9). I opposed this bill to regulate the manufacture, distribution and use of pesticides because it was fundamentally weakened to reflect the interests of big pesticides manufacturers. Amendment to delete bill's provision that a pesticide may not be prohibited on account of its lack of "essentiality." (Y) Y152,N221. Amendment to allow consumer groups to seek court review of EPA pesticides decisions. (Y) Y167,N209. Amendment to deny reimbursement to producers of recalled pesticides unless harmful effects could not have been anticipated. (Y) Y168,N203. Final passage. (N) Y288,N91.

BLACK LUNG, HR9212 (10). Amendment to reduce Social Security disability payments to miners receiving black lung benefits. (N) Y158, N225. Amendment to delete provision extending to 1975 black lung benefits. (N) Y133, N246. Final passage. (Y) Y311,N79.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATION, DEFENSE DEPT., HJRes 946 (10). I voted "present" to this amendment which would have withheld funds for the Defense Department after November 15, 1971, pending action on the regular Defense Dept. appropriation bill. Y10, N356.

RHODESIAN CHROME, HR8687 (10). I opposed this effort to require the President, contrary to both expressed United Nations policy and current United States policy, to import chromium from the racist government of Rhodesia. (N) Y251,N100.

D.C. REVENUE, HR11341(11). Motion to debate 1971 D.C. revenue act. (Y) Y359,N8. Amendment to eliminate \$44 million increase in Federal payment to D.C. (N) Y79,N263. Amendment to increase Federal payment by \$25 million, not \$44 million. (N) Y119,N210. Amendment exempting interstate truck drivers from D.C. wage and hour laws. (Y) Y139, N179. Final passage. (Y) Y248,N50.

CANCER RESEARCH, HR11302(15). To authorize \$1.5 billion over the next three fiscal years for the purpose of conquering cancer, and to enlarge the authority of the National Cancer Institute within the National Institutes of Health. (Y) Y350,N5.

INTERPOL, HR11350(15). Increasing to \$55,000 U.S. dues to International Criminal Police Organization. (Y) Y346,N0.

COPYRIGHT, SJRes132(15). To extend until December 31, 1972, the expiration date of certain copyrights. (N) Y302,N49.

VETERANS' BENEFITS, HR11651(15). Increasing non-service-connected pension payments for veterans and their widows. (Y) Y350,N0. HR11652(15). Increasing benefits for survivors of veterans who die in service. (Y) Y350,N0.

REDWOOD PARK—TAX, HR11080(15). To give special tax advantages to logging companies which owned land in Redwood National Park. (N) Y149,N203.

\$71 BILLION DEFENSE FUNDS—F-14—TROOP LEVELS—INDOCHINA, HR11731(16-17). Amendment to eliminate \$801.6 million for procurement of F-14 aircraft. (Y) Y76,N311. Amendment limiting to 60 days period in which president can increase number of military personnel without Congressional approval. (Y) Y183,N210. Boland amendment to terminate Indochina war funding after June 1, 1972, and seek prompt withdrawal of U.S. troops, subject to release of all prisoners of war. (Y) Y163,N238. My statement on

the Boland amendment is at page H11181 of November 17 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Amendment to limit fiscal 1972 Defense Dept. spending to 95% of Administration request. (Y) Y74,N308. Amendment to limit fiscal 1972 Defense Dept. funding to fiscal 1971 level. (Y) Y114,N278. Final passage of \$71 billion Defense Dept. appropriations for fiscal 1972. (N) Y343,N51.

FOREIGN AID, HRes710(18). Resolution to send House-passed foreign aid bill (HR9910) to a House-Senate Conference. (Y) Y269,N115. CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT, HJRes946(18). Motion to debate conference report providing funds for agencies whose funds had not yet been signed into law. (Y) Y367,N15. Final passage. (Y) Y344, N26.

RADIO FREE EUROPE, S18(19). Authorizing financial assistance for, and review of, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Motion to debate. (Y) Y290,N3. Final passage. (Y) Y271, N12.

CAMPAIGN FINANCING REFORM, HR11060(29-30). On November 30, the House passed legislation to regulate political campaign spending by candidates for Congress and the Presidency. I supported this bill. Amendment to eliminate lowest-rate advertising provisions and to eliminate requirement that newspapers give equal access to advertising space to candidates for the same office. (N) Y145,N219. Amendment eliminating lowest-rate television advertising for candidates. (N) Y219,N150. Amendment to repeal FCC rule requiring broadcasters to give "equal time" to all candidates for same office. (N) Y95,N277. Amendment to prohibit use of union dues for political purposes. (Y) Y233,N147. Amendment deleting requirement that candidates file campaign disclosure statements with clerk of nearest U.S. court. (Y) Y230,N154. See explanation at page H11538 of the December 1 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Final passage of bill limiting campaign expenditures and prescribing more rigorous disclosure procedures. (Y) Y372,N23.

#### DECEMBER

PASSENGER VESSELS, HR11589 (1). To authorize the sale of certain U.S.-flag ocean liners to foreign purchasers. (N) Y253,N139.

D.C. APPROPRIATIONS, HR11932 (2). To debate the bill. (Y) Y380,N0. Amendment to appropriate \$72 million for D.C. government's cost of continued construction of subway system. (Y) Y196,N183. Amendment to halt subway funds. (N) Y163,N205. Second amendment to authorize subway funds. (Y) Y195, N174.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, HR11955(2). To delete fiscal 1972 supplemental appropriations bill. (Y) Y308,N29. Final passage of bill appropriating \$786 million in fiscal 1972 funds for a variety of agencies and departments. (Y) Y271,N20.

NAVAL SHIP LOANS, HR9526 (6). To loan 16 naval vessels to Spain, Turkey, Greece, Italy Air Transport Fair, HR11624 (6). To authorize and South Korea. (N) Y260,N116.

Transportation Department's 1972 aeronautical exposition. (N) Y202,N173.\*

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, HR45 (6). To establish an independent Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. (Y) Y240, N135.\* My statement in support of this bill is at page H11798 of the December 6 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MORTGAGE RATES, SJRes176 (6). To extend HUD Secretary's authority to set maximum interest rates for government-backed mortgages, and for related purposes. (Y) Y357, N4.

POSTAL SERVICE PROPERTY, HR11809 (6). To continue assistance for schools in Federally-impacted areas by retaining Federal ownership of Postal Service property in those areas. (Y) Y259,N112.

SEA MAMMALS, HR10420(6). To require a permit for the killing of sea mammals for com-

mercial purposes or sport, this bill was opposed by a wide range of interested groups. (N) Y199,N150.\*

OEO-CHILD DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE REPORT, S2007(7). I strongly supported this bill to extend Office of Economic Opportunity programs, to authorize a comprehensive voluntary child development program, and to establish a nonprofit legal services corporation, and I was deeply distressed when President Nixon vetoed the bill. (Y) Y211,N187. My statement regarding the veto is at page E13422 of the December 14 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS, HR12067 (8). Amendment to add \$50 million to U.S. contribution to U.N. development program for underdeveloped countries. (Y) Y119,N268. Final passage of bill appropriating \$3.003 billion for foreign assistance, including Agency for International Development, Peace Corps and other assistance programs. (Y) Y214, N179.

GRAIN RESERVE, HRes728(8). Motion to vote on proposal to increase feed grains loan rates. (N) Y204,N164. Amendment providing for grain storage in producer-owned facilities only, rather than producer-owned and commercial facilities. (N) Y147,N179. Amendment to strike provision for 25% increase in feed grains loan rate. (N) Y128,N222. Amendment to require the release price of grain reserves to be set at 100% of parity price instead of 120% of the past five year average market price. (Parity is the relationship of crop production costs to farmers' selling price.) (N) Y145,N201. Amendment to store grain reserves in homes of "hungry Americans." (N) Y17,N271. Final passage of bill authorizing establishing reserve supply of 300 million bushels of wheat and 25 million tons of feed grains. (N) Y182,N170.

REVENUE CONFERENCE REPORT, HR10947(9). I opposed this tax bill for a number of reasons, but particularly because it gave disproportionate relief to large corporations at the expense of individual taxpayers, and in the process reduced tax revenues by \$28 billion over three years. (N) Y321,N75. My statement with respect to the tax bill begins at page H12128 of the December 9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PROCEDURE, HRes729(9). To waive rule requiring filing of conference reports three days before they are considered. (Y) Y342,N48.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT, HR11955(9). Appropriating \$3.4 billion in fiscal 1972 funds for a variety of depts. and agencies. (Y) Y302,N73.

PHASE 2 AUTHORITY, HR11309(10). Amendment to require that wage increases negotiated before August 15 be paid retroactively only if price or other increases had been made to accommodate the pay increases. (N) Y209,N151. My statement on retroactivity of wages is at page H12254 of the December 10 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Amendment to require that all data supplied to Wage and Price Boards, except trade secrets, be available to the public. (Y) Y73,N275. Amendment granting President authority to regulate pension and retirement plans which the bill otherwise exempts from controls. (N) Y170,N184. Final passage of bill extending through April 30, 1973, the President's authority to implement Phase 2 controls. (Y) Y326,N33.

D.C. REVENUE CONFERENCE REPORT, HR11341 (10). (Y) Y242,N93.

D.C. HOSPITALS, HR11628(13). To authorize \$130 million in loans and grants to finance hospital construction in D.C. (Y) Y160,N200. ALASKAN NATIVE CLAIMS CONFERENCE REPORT, HR10367(14). To settle land claims by granting 40 million acres of land, cash, and certain mineral rights to Alaskan natives. (Y) Y307,N60.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT HR11731(15). I opposed this bill to appropriate \$70.5 billion in fiscal 1972 funds for the Defense Dept. My statement on the defense

budget is at page H11181 of the November 17 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

D.C. APPROPRIATIONS, HR11932(15). Appropriating \$272 million for D.C. for fiscal 1972. (Y) Y260,N79.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION CONFERENCE REPORT, HR 6065(15). Extending emergency unemployment compensation 13 weeks in high unemployment areas. (Y) Y194,N149.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, HJRes1005(15). Extending through February 22, 1972, foreign aid funds. (Y) Y235,N86.

INSTRUCT CONFEREES, S2819(16). Motion to table motion to instruct House conferees to agree to Mansfield amendment to foreign aid bill. (Not voting) Y130,N101.

The First Session of the 92nd Congress ended on December 17.

#### LEGISLATION SPONSORED

Among the many bills which I have sponsored in Congress are the following, listed according to the House committees to which they have been referred:

APPROPRIATIONS. HR8917. To fund nutrition projects under Title IV of the Older Americans Act.

ARMED SERVICES. HR2604. To provide that members of the Armed Forces be assigned to duty stations near their homes after serving in combat zones. HR5845. To prohibit transportation of chemical warfare munitions outside the United States. HConRes236. Resolving that NATO allies should contribute more to costs of their own defense.

BANKING AND CURRENCY. HConRes423. To exempt individuals in poverty from Phase 2 controls.

EDUCATION AND LABOR. HR11131. To provide tutoring for handicapped children through the use of college students and veterans. HR12036. To expand the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 and create 500,000 new Federally-funded public service jobs.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS. HR4225. Regarding the use of military funds in Laos. HR5228. To prohibit a U.S. invasion of North Vietnam without Congressional authorization. HR11017. To provide that U.S. passports shall not disclose the place of birth of persons to whom they are issued. HConRes304. Seeking suspension of military aid to Pakistan pending resolution of India-Pakistan conflict. HRes 54. Seeking a definite date for U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. HRes455. Seeking Yiddish broadcasts to Soviet Jews over Voice of America. HConRes424. Calling for a free and united Ireland.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS. HR4430. Consumer Protection Act of 1971. HR5974. Requiring that individuals be informed of records concerning them which are maintained by government agencies.

INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE. HR2294. To encourage physicians and dentists to practice in areas where shortages of such personnel exist. HR3656. Conquest of Cancer Act. HR8438. To require clear labeling indicating dates of useful life of food items. HR10208. To authorize reduced-rate transportation for handicapped and individuals 65 and over.

JUDICIARY. HR9378. To make additional immigrant visas available. HJRes941. To lower the age requirement for membership in the House of Representatives from 25 to 22, and in the Senate from 30 to 27.

RULES. HRes120. To create a Committee on Aging. HRes328. To create a Select Committee to investigate all aspects of energy resources in the United States.

WAYS AND MEANS. HR850. To extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns. HR4245. To in-

clude prescription drug costs within Medicare program. HR4933. To terminate the oil import quota program. HR7836. To allow a tax deduction for expenses incurred by homeowners in making repairs and improvements to their homes. HR10263. To remove the limitation on the amount of outside income an individual may earn while receiving Social Security benefits.

I sincerely welcome comments or inquiries from any constituent regarding any of the foregoing matters.

#### BREZHNEV: ASCENT TO POWER

#### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon travels to the Soviet Union this May he will be actively involved in discussions with L. I. Brezhnev, the apparent first among equals in the Soviet leadership and general-secretary of the party.

Because of Brezhnev's position, it is important that we in the Congress be well acquainted with his background. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to read the following article from the summer 1971 issue of *Orbis*, a quarterly journal of foreign affairs. The article, written by Paul A. Smith, Jr., is a biological treatment of Brezhnev from childhood through 1968.

The following article is copyrighted 1971 by the Foreign Policy Research Institute.

#### BREZHNEV: ASCENT TO POWER

(by Paul A. Smith, Jr.)

(NOTE.—This article, part of a larger study in progress, will appear later in 1971 in the book, *Leaders of the Communist World*, edited by Roger Swearingen (New York: The Free Press). It draws upon information available to Western scholars up to September 1968 and covers Brezhnev's career through the Twenty-third Party Congress in March-April 1966. The author is now working on a second article based on information available on Brezhnev's life between the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Party Congress.)

"A stocky figure dressed in a bulky, dark brown double-breasted suit, with huge bushy eyebrows dominating his flushed face. He seemed somber and dull. . . ." The description is by a member of the Western press corps in Moscow in 1963, when Leonid Brezhnev was chief of state. A Soviet official later warned a Western associate not to underestimate Brezhnev. He knew, the Soviet said, that Western observers had written Brezhnev off as a figurehead. Those who did so, he said, were making a mistake.<sup>1</sup>

The advice was sound. On October 14, 1964, Brezhnev replaced his patron Khrushchev by election of the Party Central Committee as First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The other half of Khrushchev's power, the premiership of the USSR, was given to Alexi Kosygin, a member of the Party Presidium and a long-time government official. The shift brought Brezhnev to a pinnacle of pre-eminence within the USSR and—Mao notwithstanding—throughout the communist world.

Four years later Brezhnev had completed the equivalent, in time, of a United States President's first term in office. His command of the levers of power was still not comparable to that of his predecessor; control of the government still rested in the capable hands of his colleague Kosygin. But his

stature and authority within the party had been strengthened by a gradual and effective distancing of his two chief rivals—Podgorny and Shelepin—from positions of influence and control.

The man whom the Soviet elite has chosen as its spokesman and most eminent member is well qualified to represent it. Before coming to power in 1964 he played, contrary to popular belief, an important behind-the-scenes role in domestic and international communist affairs for nearly fifteen years. Earlier, he had proved himself in some of the most important regional assignments available to a party official. Today, despite Mao's disaffection and troubles in Eastern Europe, Brezhnev remains heir to the mantle of authority in world communism created by Lenin, enlarged by Stalin, and defended by Khrushchev.

Many Western scholars remain unimpressed, however. One has described him as "an insignificant transition figure in a new interregnum and a succession crisis that has not yet come to a head."<sup>2</sup> But a Western diplomat who worked with him expressed admiration for his "absolute level-headedness" and appreciation of his "spirit devoid of fanaticism," his "courtesy" and "human warmth." Noting that Brezhnev tends to rely more on conciliation than on force, the same observer wondered whether he had the energy necessary to maintain concord and to check the inevitable ambitions among his peers.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps; perhaps not. But let us look at the record.

#### LABOR ARISTOCRAT

Brezhnev comes from the Ukraine and still makes it his political base. His native region, earlier called Ekatorinoslav, today Dnepropetrovsk, straddles the Dnieper River, a major artery of trade and conquest since Byzantine days. In the nineteenth century the river helped to open the region to world commerce, based on the grain trade, and to make it one of the leading industrial regions of the empire. Brezhnev was born on its banks in 1906, in a small river port known then as Kamenskoe and now called Dnieprodzerzhinsk, about twenty miles upstream from the provincial capital of Ekatorinoslav.<sup>4</sup>

In Brezhnev's childhood Kamenskoe was one of a number of thriving industrial towns along the Dnieper. An iron foundry, in existence since the 1880's was located there. The population of the area was mixed—Ukrainians, Great Russians, Jews, Germans, Greeks, Bulgarians and Tatars. In the towns the Russians and the Jews predominated; in the countryside the farmers were more independent, more individualistic, and more outward oriented than the traditional Russian peasant. In 1908 the provincial parliamentary of Ekatorinoslav sent an agricultural agent to the middlewestern region of the United States to study the crops there, procure agricultural machinery and investigate the market for Ukrainian products. This spirit and the rapid industrialization in the towns gave the nickname "Little America" to the area.

There is no indication from official or other sources that Brezhnev or his family were involved either in prerevolutionary political movements or in the turmoil later. But the region was politically volatile. Where as the Russians tended to be concerned with social and economic problems and with a variety of utopian schemes purporting to offer solutions to them, the Ukrainians were more interested in asserting the claims of their culture and their separate nationality. The result was a heady brew of national and social strivings expressed in a spectrum of outlawed political groups. The Bolsheviks and the Social Revolutionaries were strongly established in the industrial towns by the turn of the century. In the countryside a variety of anarchist movements agitated the farmers and village craftsmen. During World War I, in Brezhnev's early teens, the region was oc-

\*Footnote: Asterisk indicates bill failed because it arose under procedure requiring support of two-thirds of those voting.

Footnotes at end of article.

cupled by the Austro-Hungarians, torn by revolution, and ravaged in the civil conflict that followed the revolution. City and country alike were sacked with equal fervor and savage abandon by Reds, Whites, peasant anarchists, Ukrainian nationalists and bandits. Asked what he did during the French Revolution, one of the participants is said to have replied: "I survived." Perhaps the Brezhnev felt themselves fortunate to have done the same.

Brezhnev is generally presumed to be a Russian. At least his name is Russian, and the fact that he comes from an urban rather than a rural background strengthens the presumption. His speech is colored by the Ukraine, but no more so than is to be expected from a man born and raised in the region. Soviet biographic sources describe him as born in the family of a metal worker, and he has claimed in conversation to be a fifth-generation steelman; a brother worked in Poland as a metallurgical engineer after World War II.<sup>8</sup> It would seem a plausible assumption that Brezhnev comes from a stratum in the prerevolutionary working class which cherished a respect for family traditions and skills, but which was not attracted by the political and social radicalism of the Marxists—a stratum resentfully characterized by Lenin as "labor aristocrats."

#### LIFE IN THE PROVINCES

Brezhnev worked his way through the Soviet equivalent of high school and college, and made a living professionally as a surveyor and later as a metallurgical engineer, academic and city official for the first thirty years of his life.

In 1921 the New Economic Plan was launched. In the Ukraine the guerrilla leader, Makhno, led the remnants of his once powerful peasant anarchists across the Dnieper for the last time to seek refuge in Rumania from the Red Army. An uneasy peace returned to the land, permitting many youngsters, including Brezhnev, to begin their working careers. Soviet biographic sketches say he began work at fifteen and simultaneously studied to become a land surveyor. Which was his primary occupation is not clear. But the proletarian image is qualified at an early age by his developing interest in technique, in precision, and in intellectual tools of professional caliber.

The scholastic side apparently predominated. In 1927, at the age of twenty-one, Brezhnev graduated from a technical college for land utilization and reclamation in the city of Kursk, a provincial capital of 80,000 people in southern Russia. For three years, until 1930, he used his skills as a surveyor and land-utilization specialist, first in the Kursk Provincial Administration, and later for a period in the Urals where he rose to a responsible position on the provincial land-utilization board of Sverdlovsk.

The 1920's, the period when Brezhnev received his basic education and spent his formative working years on the land, was the heyday of the farmer under Soviet power. In the fall of 1922 the Soviet government adopted a series of legal codes whose purpose was to give the farmer a sense of security. The principle of nationalization was affirmed. But the right of utilization could be exercised in a number of forms—in the traditional system of repartition within a community, in individual holdings, or in voluntary associations. For almost a decade the farmer enjoyed two significant freedoms: the right to choose the form in which the land was to be cultivated, and the privilege of disposing of his surplus products on the open market.<sup>9</sup> Brezhnev's opinion on these events is unknown. But it may be significant that he has been intimately associated with three of the four major initiatives in agricultural policy under Soviet power: the land reform of the 1920's, the Virgin Lands program of 1954, and the rationalization and refinancing of agri-

cultural management which he proposed in March 1965. All three have been relatively successful, at least by Soviet standards. The fourth major innovation was the collectivization program launched by Stalin in 1929. Brezhnev may have been involved in its initial stages, but he escaped its conclusion. In 1950, for unknown reasons, he abruptly dropped a promising future in agriculture and returned to industry.

In 1928, when Brezhnev was still in the Urals, the first Five Year Plan was launched, and in 1929 the collectivization of agriculture began. The result was a five-year war between the party, backed by the urban proletariat, and a terrorized and eventually decimated farm population. The consequences for the farmers, the country and the rule of the party were immense. Characteristic of the severity of the struggle was a remark by party leader Kaganovich at a party congress in the late 1920's. Charged by a speaker from the floor with carrying out a program so severe that it resulted in cannibalism in the villages, Kaganovich shot back: "If we lose our nerve now, they will eat us! Is that better?"<sup>10</sup> The result was an all-out drive by the party to push through collectivization. In order to strengthen the nerve of the local village communists, 25,000 workers with adequate political organizational experience were dispatched from the towns and were followed by many more. In the winter and spring of 1930 over half of the total farm households in the country were forced into collectives. By early 1932 the resulting disintegration of the farm economy resulted in such famine and turmoil that, as Churchill was later told by Stalin, close to ten million people were "affected" and, Stalin implied, wiped out.<sup>11</sup>

Where was Brezhnev? The evidence is conflicting. With one exception the official biographies simply say that from 1930 to 1935 he worked, and also studied at a metallurgical institute in his hometown of Dneprodzerzhinsk. The exception is an entry in the *Yearbook of the Soviet Encyclopedia* for 1962 which says that "In 1930-31 [he] studied at the Agricultural Institute in Moscow." The ambiguity is significant, for 1931 was not only the moment of truth when the party realized the cost of pushing through collectivization regardless of human suffering; it was also the year when Brezhnev became a member of the party.

Why did he go to Moscow? What happened to him there? Why did he leave under circumstances amounting to an abrupt change of professions? And what motivated him to enter the party? Again, we must fall back on circumstantial evidence. The agricultural institute in Moscow which Brezhnev attended is presumably the Timiryazeff Academy, in the northwest suburbs of the city—one of the *Grandes Ecoles* of Soviet power, and an intellectual establishment of no mean standing, under a different name, before the Revolution. Admission to it was an accomplishment for a young provincial surveyor and minor official. A degree from this academy would put its holder on the path to higher positions in the state bureaucracy. Yet Brezhnev failed to obtain a degree and chose to disregard its advantages in order to work his way through a provincial industrial college.

The *Yearbook* does not tell us whether Brezhnev joined the party in Moscow or later in Dneprodzerzhinsk. It merely says "He entered the Party in 1931." Since the party requires a period of twelve months as a candidate before membership is accorded, the presumption is that Brezhnev made his decision either in Moscow or even earlier, in Sverdlovsk at the time he was selected to attend the Timiryazeff Academy. Quite possibly the two things were connected. At that time the party was pursuing a conscious policy of training a new generation of socialist intelligentsia of proletarian origins to replace the older intelligentsia whom it regarded as still tainted by their past and therefore un-

reliable for the stresses of Stalin's program of forced-draft industrialization. Party membership was more than doubled between 1928 and 1933, and its social composition was profoundly changed. In January 1929 a Central Committee directive required that 90 per cent of all party recruits from industrial areas and 70 per cent from rural areas should be workers in production. In April 1930 workers actually engaged in production were to form nearly half of the party.<sup>12</sup> Brezhnev was one of the many who benefited from the changes by gaining entree to the training he sought.

Whether Brezhnev joined the party from conviction or from more practical motives is not a fair question. At the time the two were probably mutually reinforcing for any young man of working-class origins with the interest and ability for higher education. On the side of conviction there is the consideration, according to some versions of the Soviet *Encyclopedia Yearbook*, that he joined the Communist Youth Organization (Komsomol) at nineteen. On the other hand, the year in which he joined, 1923, was one in which the party made vigorous efforts to appeal to young people by adopting measures to improve working conditions for young factory workers and to give them some degree of protection against unemployment by imposing minimum quotas of juveniles on plant management and by instituting a system of factory schools of the kind Brezhnev attended. The organization itself was overhauled and greatly expanded in membership.<sup>13</sup> In the case of the Komsomol, as later in the case of party membership, the timing and circumstances of Brezhnev's entry point more to a practical assessment of what was personally advantageous than to overwhelming ideological commitment.

This is not meant to deny that there was a great fund of innate enthusiasm among Komsomolites and party members in the early days of Soviet power. During the Revolution and the civil war the movement was small and militant; membership involved risk and devotion, often of selfless and heroic proportions. Later, when the Five Year Plan was well launched, there was a more massive wave of enthusiasm, but of a different kind. Young Komsomols were mobilized by the thousands to construct giant industrial combines, to open up Siberia, and to help stamp out illiteracy. This was the peak of inspirational bolshevism, the time when a party member could say and firmly believe, as one of its members later said: "The essential characteristic of the Party is that it is bounded by no laws, it is always extending the realm of the possible until nothing becomes impossible, nothing inadmissible for it, nothing unrealizable."<sup>14</sup> Brezhnev's experience in Siberia involved him in the early phases of this movement, and he appears to have thrived in it and used it to advantage by obtaining the appointment to Moscow. Membership in the party was a logical next step. But something went wrong, at least in Brezhnev's case.

It has been suggested that his switch from agriculture to industry was of Brezhnev's own choosing.<sup>15</sup> The supposition is that he acted from essentially opportunistic motives, recognizing that rural life under conditions of collectivization might prove not only nasty and brutish, but extremely short. Industry, on the other hand, was clearly the wave of the future. On the basis of this no doubt sound assessment, Brezhnev sacrificed the benefits and prestige of a Moscow education for the longer-term advantages of professional qualifications in industry, even though obtained in the provinces. The argument is plausible, but not fully convincing. Having invested two years in training a promising young man as an agronomist at the foremost institution in the country, it is strange that the appropriate governmental department, to say nothing of the party, would be willing to see him lost to his profession, at a time when agriculture desperately needed quali-

Footnotes at end of article.

fied personnel, simply to satisfy his own predilections.

A more likely line of speculation is that the change was made primarily for the convenience of someone other than Brezhnev; someone who could have been either a relatively impersonal bureaucrat concerned with cadre requirements for specific program needs, or some senior official either already in Dneprodzerzhinsk or on his way there whose eye was caught by Brezhnev.

A third possibility—given the atmosphere in Moscow, and in the schools in particular—is that Brezhnev found himself on the wrong side of a political debate, and was dismissed from the academy. In this case, it would have been natural for him to turn to the area he knew best, where he presumably had personal friends, to recoup as best he could in another and potentially more promising field.

On the evidence at hand it is difficult to exclude any of these hypotheses, or indeed any combination of them. Several considerations tend to point in the direction of the bureaucratic explanation. The spirit and practice of the times were clearly attuned to mobilization in the military sense. The internal war in the countryside had riddled the party's ranks. A lowered standard of living in the towns was followed by absenteeism among workers, resulting in repressive measures, direction of labor and strict factory discipline. In 1932 internal passports were introduced, and the party as well as industrial management had accustomed itself to dispose of its technicians as well as its workers as the military disposed of troops. Combined with this was the consideration that Dneprodzerzhinsk had been the subject of a special Central Committee resolution in 1929 providing for the development and further expansion of its steel works.<sup>14</sup> Brezhnev's record as a qualified worker with the proper proletarian background, experience with the plant and its people, and demonstrated ability in professional work might have been enough in themselves to result in transfer "at the convenience of the government." Finally, there is the point that a purge of the party, undertaken in January 1933, resulted in some 800,000 members being dropped out of a total strength of just over 3.5 million. Had Brezhnev stumbled in Moscow it is unlikely that he would have survived the purge, particularly as the many new members taken during the rapid expansion after 1928 were the first to go.

Whatever the causes, the fact is that in 1931 Brezhnev returned to Dneprodzerzhinsk, where he remained until 1935, "studying at the Metallurgical Institute," according to the latest Soviet biographic sketch. Earlier versions add that he worked concurrently in the local steel mill. In this same year—1931—another student from one of the Moscow academies also failed to complete his full course of study, although for a different reason. Following a purge of right-wing oppositionists, in which he played a role as informer, Nikita Khrushchev was appointed to head the party unit in the district of Moscow where his academy was located, and within six months he added to it the party leadership of another and even more important district. Unlike Brezhnev, Khrushchev's time at the academy served to launch him directly into the world of Moscow politics.<sup>15</sup>

#### THE MOVE INTO MANAGEMENT

Over the next ten years, Brezhnev would do the same, but by a slower route. Until 1935, so far as we know, he continued to study and work—no easy task under conditions of the first Five Year Plan—and in 1935 he successfully completed his course. By doing so, Brezhnev qualified himself for membership in a new generation of party officials who, unlike their predecessors, have substantive technical educations. He also is one of those who experienced the stresses of

forced industrialization while actually occupied in production. Although a party member at this time, he was apparently not functioning as a full-time party organizer.

Brezhnev seems to have found time during these years for some personal life. Judging from the ages of his children, he must have been married by 1932 or 1933, and his daughter was born soon thereafter. A son followed later, and a second son was born toward the end of World War II.<sup>16</sup>

Information on Brezhnev's activities after his graduation in 1935 is contradictory. The latest Soviet biography (in the 1968 *Kommunist Spravochnik Kalendar*) has him doing military service after graduation, followed in 1937–1938 by a position as director of a technical high school in Dneprodzerzhinsk and service on the city council. Earlier versions (1961 Soviet Encyclopedia Yearbook) fail to mention military service—an unusual omission for any politician—and merely say that he worked as an engineer from 1935 until 1937. The *Politicheskii Slovar*, published in 1958 also fails to mention military service, but adds the information that he "worked as an engineer at the F. E. Dzerzhinski Factory," the mill in Dneprodzerzhinsk.<sup>17</sup>

The Soviet sources tend to agree that 1938 marked the beginning of Brezhnev's career as a full-time party organizer, first as chief of a section and later as one of the secretaries of the Dnepropetrovsk Regional Party Committee. This change is one of the turning points in Brezhnev's life. To be city councilman in Dneprodzerzhinsk (population 120,000) is one thing; to be a section chief in the effective seat of power—the party apparatus—of one of the major industrial regions of the USSR, with a population of more than two million, is quite another. Positions on a city council in the USSR are often given to technicians, school directors, and outstanding workers. They are there as window dressing, and, when they possess professional skills, to provide appropriate advice if asked. They are not participants in the political process, and they are not expected to play an active role in the actual conduct of government. A party official at the regional level is a man with a grasp on the real sources of power. Through his chief, the party leader in the region, he wields a substantial measure of authority in interpreting directives from the central party authority, located in this case in Kiev and through it in Moscow. He has the power to recommend appointment and dismissal, and carries a heavy burden of responsibility for controlling and verifying the fulfillment of economic, political and social tasks assigned to the region.

The cause of this sudden change in Brezhnev's fortunes is clear when we look at developments in the party in the late 1930's. The purge trials, begun by Stalin after Kirov's murder in 1934, reached their peak in 1936–1938. In August and November of 1936, in January and June of 1937, and in February–March of 1938 trials took place in Moscow of leading party officials who were duly sentenced and executed or imprisoned for long terms. A comparable process was taking place throughout the party at lower levels, resulting in such a massive turnover that by 1939 at the Nineteenth Party Congress only 19 per cent of the delegates were those who had joined the party before World War I, as compared with 81 per cent at the 1934 congress. This process was particularly marked in the Ukraine, where almost all of the higher officials serving in 1937 were replaced by the end of 1938 by persons who had previously been too obscure for public notice.<sup>18</sup> Brezhnev was one such person.

The purge of the Ukraine was carried out by a man with whom Brezhnev's career would henceforth be closely associated. In January 1938 Nikita Khrushchev arrived in Kiev as party boss of the Ukrainian Republic. By June he had assumed a position in the Republic comparable to that occupied by Stalin at the All-Union level: He was the ranking member of the Ukrainian Politbu-

reau, Orgbureau and Secretariat, and had personal control of the Kiev regional and city party organizations. He used his position to install his own men in the apparatus, and he and they proceeded to raise up a new generation of younger party officials throughout the Republic. Khrushchev's predecessor in the Ukraine, Postyshev, was dropped from the CPSU Politbureau later in the year, purged from the party, and subsequently shot. Most of his colleagues who were removed by Khrushchev suffered a similar fate, so much so that Khrushchev, who had recently lost his first wife, became familiarly known as the "Bloody Widower of the Ukraine."<sup>19</sup>

Three aspects of this affair are worthy of note insofar as Brezhnev is concerned. The first is that there is no clear evidence that he had an active role to play in the actual purges; as a technician and holder of a largely honorific position in a city government, he was probably not in a position to do so even if he had wanted to. At the most, he might have been able to participate in the wave of denunciations on which many of the purge trials were based. There is no indication that he attempted to play such a role. The second consideration is that he clearly benefited from the purge by stepping promptly into the shoes of his fallen superiors in the party hierarchy. The third and most significant aspect of Brezhnev's entry into politics at this time is that he became a part of what was to become one of the most stable and politically cohesive groupings in the Soviet Communist Party—the Ukrainian party apparatus. This grouping is by no means monolithic. But compared with other regional groupings within the party, such as the Leningraders, the Belorussians or the Georgians, it has been far and away the most successful in getting and holding power at the Moscow level.

Brezhnev did well in this group from the start. In 1939, a year after embarking on full-time political work at the managerial level, he was appointed first secretary of the Dnepropetrovsk region. He held the position until he was driven from the city by the Germans in 1941.

#### WAR AND CONQUEST

Brezhnev spent the war years as a high-level political officer fighting in the Caucasus, the Ukraine and Czechoslovakia. Commissioned a colonel at the outset, he was promoted to major general in 1943. His functional responsibilities were purely political. The *Encyclopedia Yearbook* (1962) describes him as "Deputy Chief of the Political Directorate of a Front; Chief of the Political Directorate of an Army; Chief of the Political Directorate of a Front, later of a Military District." Other versions reveal that the front was the Fourth Ukrainian, and the army the 18th Ukrainian. The military district, at war's end, was the Carpathian, with headquarters at Czernowitz. Brezhnev's fighting was on his home ground—the Ukraine and its approaches.

Brezhnev's status in the party was enhanced by his military service. The 1959 edition of the official *History of the CPSU* described the wartime service of party leaders under three headings: "eminent party figures who were dispatched for leading work in the Army," others who "managed the national economy and provided the Red Army with all necessary supplies," and finally, "experienced Party workers who became members of Military Councils of Fronts and Armies." Brezhnev is listed among the regional and Republic party leaders who served in the third category.<sup>20</sup>

Information on Brezhnev's combat experience is scarce, although the units he was with had a high proportion of time in action. In December 1942 he was involved in fighting in the foothills of the northern Caucasus.<sup>21</sup> In 1943 he was mentioned as taking part in a successful amphibious operation near the Black Sea port of Novorossiisk. In

Footnotes at end of article.

February 1945 he appears again, in an account of preparations for the reconquest of Czechoslovakia. In the Novorossisk operation he was pulled unconscious from the sea after being blown out of a landing barge, which may possibly make him the only Soviet leader with any practical experience in naval warfare.<sup>22</sup> Otherwise, there is no record of his having been wounded.

In 1968, during the Czechoslovak crisis, Brezhnev is reported to have taken time during the Bratislava meetings with Czechoslovak leaders to visit a military cemetery. He is also said to have wept on at least one occasion during the conference.<sup>23</sup> One of the participants on the Czech side was General Ludvik Svoboda, at the time President of Czechoslovakia. In 1945 Svoboda commanded the Czech First Army Corps fighting under the command of the 18th Ukrainian Army in which Brezhnev was chief political officer. Marshal Grechko, whom Brezhnev made his Minister of Defense in 1965, served on the same front.<sup>24</sup>

In describing preparations for the Czechoslovak campaign in 1945, the Soviet official history of the war notes that "the Party-political work of the 18th Ukrainian Army, whose Chief Political Officer was Major General L. I. Brezhnev, was distinguished for its variety and political effectiveness." A subsequent paragraph then quotes some remarks by an older enlisted man, who happened to come from the area, as an example of the spirit animating the troops. "In the First World War under Brusilov," the old soldier said, "we almost took that hill over there, but we didn't make it. Now, after thirty years, I'm getting another chance and I don't intend to stop until we've finished off Hitler Germany."<sup>25</sup>

In June 1945 the Soviet High Command ordered all Soviet troops out of Czechoslovakia, with the exception of certain forces left in the Sudetenland. The system of Soviet military Kommandaturas was abolished. It was presumably at this time that Brezhnev was transferred to the military district headquarters in Czernowitz, where he stayed until sometime in 1946.<sup>26</sup>

Managing the politico-military affairs of the Carpathian Military District offered an experience that was novel for most Soviet leaders of Brezhnev's generation. The district included two areas that had never really been sovietized: the former Czechoslovak territory of Ruthenia and the part of Rumania known as Northern Bukovina. Their incorporation in 1945 into the Soviet Ukraine involved a thorough economic and social upheaval, including the nationalization of property and businesses, the collectivization of agriculture, and related political changes. The result, of course, was a large measure of civil unrest, including the operation of partisan bands and other forms of armed resistance.

#### REGIONAL POWER AND NATIONAL PROMINENCE

For Brezhnev, the postwar years until the death of Stalin in 1953 brought hard work and steady progress. Major regional assignments in his native Dnieper area were rewarded in 1950 by two years as the party boss of the Moldavian Republic. In 1952, at the last party congress before Stalin's death, Brezhnev moved to Moscow and assignments which meant membership in the elite. The key to his success was without much doubt a close relationship to Nikita Khrushchev.

In November 1943 the Germans were driven from Kiev, and Soviet power was re-established in the Ukraine. The problems—both human and material—were enormous: the re-establishment of order in a population emerging from over two years of intensified brutalization by the Gestapo, and the reconstruction of an economy ransacked by the retreating German forces. During 1945 and 1946 Khrushchev carried out a process of testing, discarding and selectively promoting party cadres in the Ukraine. The result

in Brezhnev's case, was favorable. In the fall of 1946 he was appointed first secretary of Zaporozhia, an industrial region of 1.5 million people on the Dnieper between Dnepropetrovsk and the Black Sea.

Today, Zaporozhia is one of the major industrial regions of the USSR, producing aluminum, high-grade steels and a variety of machinery. A hydroelectric station is one of the showplaces of its kind, and the port facilities make the town an important center of rail and water transport. The surrounding region is a rich agricultural area in the black-earth belt. In 1946 the area may have been important to Khrushchev for another reason. Its agricultural-machinery plants produced the equipment desperately needed to get the breadbasket of the USSR into production again. The drought that struck the Ukraine in 1946 also hit Khrushchev and his followers politically. He and they survived, but for several months in the spring and summer of 1947 it was a near thing. It is not inconceivable that Brezhnev's ability in organizing the industrial backing needed for even minimum performance on the agricultural front helped turn the tide. By the winter of 1947-1948 Khrushchev's fortunes were again on the rise, and in December 1947 he was restored to full authority in the Ukrainian party apparatus, following a brief period of close supervision by his chief and long-time patron from the Moscow party apparatus, Lazar Kaganovich.

A month earlier, in November 1947, Brezhnev had been shifted from Zaporozhia. His new assignment was upstream, as party leader of the Dnepropetrovsk region. Brezhnev had held this position in 1941. But the region had changed. In 1939 the population of its principal city, also called Dnepropetrovsk, had been around 500,000. During the war nearly half of its industry was destroyed, and the people battered and decimated. By the end of the 1950's the city had been rebuilt, its industry restored and greatly expanded, and its population increased to over 700,000. The output from five steel mills and other plants included a significant percentage of the USSR's steel capacity, a wide range of finished steel products, heavy industrial equipment, and quite possibly a number of strategic defense items. Thermal power plants and rail and water transport facilities completed the picture. The foundations for this rebirth and expansion were laid under Brezhnev's rule.

In the spring of 1950 Brezhnev moved up again, this time to the national level. In December 1949 his chief, Khrushchev, left Kiev to return to Moscow as party chief of the Moscow region and as a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Brezhnev followed him for a brief period in the Central Committee apparatus, where he presumably familiarized himself with the larger considerations related to his next assignment—party leader of one of the sixteen Union Republics making up the USSR.

The Rumanian province of Bessarabia, called Moldavia by Russians and Ukrainians, is a rich prize. For an empire short of good agricultural land it is doubly desirable; the soil is fertile, the climate benign and the rainfall adequate. For centuries it has supplied distant imperial centers—Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Ottoman and Slav—with grain, fruit and wine. In 1945 it came again under Muscovite control when it was brought into the Soviet Union as the Soviet Socialist Republic of Moldavia. In 1950 its 2.7 million people were over 60 per cent non-Slav, mostly Rumanian. Normally 80 per cent collectivized in the preceding five years, its agriculture remained depressed and its farmers hostile to Soviet power.<sup>27</sup> In June 1950 a CPSU Central Committee decree formalized charges in the press against party officials in the Republic who had failed to push through the socialization of agriculture and to extract from it the return Moscow thought feasible and necessary.<sup>28</sup>

In July 1950 Brezhnev was sent to com-

plete the conquest—a task he carried out with dispatch. Within six months collectivization had been completed and "the Kulaks had been liquidated as a class."<sup>29</sup> Brezhnev introduced sharper penalties for economic crimes and moved vigorously against resistance groups cooperating with like-minded groupings in adjacent provinces of the western Ukraine. Popular disaffection continued to occupy him during his tour in the Republic. In March 1951, at a congress of the Moldavian party, he devoted a large section of his report as first secretary to shortcomings in political education and means to overcome them. He then put into effect a series of cadre changes designed to strengthen his personal authority in the Moldavian party apparatus. (Some of the men whom he brought in from the Ukrainian party apparatus later followed him to Moscow and are with him today.)

The following year, in October 1952, Brezhnev reported to the Nineteenth Party Congress in Moscow on his stewardship. After outlining the accomplishments of the Republic, he pressed for a higher level of capital investment by the central government in Moldavian industry, in particular its food-processing facilities; asked for support in expanding the building trades and housing construction; and outlined measures for the elimination of illiteracy and an expansion of higher education facilities.<sup>30</sup>

Brezhnev's years in the provinces and at the national level in Moldavia gave him a thorough background in the problems of regional administration. He knows industry, and he knows labor. He has city-ward experience in urban problems. He has carried the responsibility and seen the consequences of Stalinist agricultural policy at the grass roots in two of the richest farm areas in the USSR. And he has experience in working with ethnic minority groups.

#### THE STALIN SUCCESSION AND THE MILITARY

Between 1952 and 1954 Brezhnev lived and worked in Moscow at the center of Soviet power. In the last year of Stalin's rule he moved rapidly upward. He was set back following the dictator's death, but survived the Malenkov interregnum in an apparently modest position which may have been important in his patron Khrushchev's relations with the military.

In October 1952 a party congress took place—the nineteenth of its kind and the last of Stalin's reign. The aging dictator used it, it now seems clear, to set the stage for what was to have been a major housecleaning in the upper ranks of the Soviet leadership. The top policymaking body of the party, the Presidium, was enlarged from ten to twenty-five members, plus eleven candidate-members. Stalin's purpose, many observers now feel, was to dilute the power of its original members and reduce the potential of the body as a whole as a forum for opposition to him. The new men brought in to the Presidium were being positioned by Stalin to serve as replacements when their seniors were removed. The party's executive arm, its Secretariat, was recast and expanded. Its ten members selected at the congress were balanced between supporters of Malenkov, then heir apparent to Stalin, and Khrushchev, who had lately begun to display in increasing level of activity in a sphere formerly dominated by Malenkov—the supervision of party organization and cadres. The Central Committee, the party's parliament, was also expanded to nearly twice its former size. Its 236 members and candidates included a strongly increased representation of regional party secretaries.

Brezhnev was involved in these changes. He arrived at the congress as a Republic party secretary, one of sixteen in the USSR, but not a figure in the central leadership. Moreover, he had no experience at the All-Union level, aside from a few months in 1950 spent in the Secretariat apparatus presumably preparing for his Moldavian assign-

Footnotes at end of article.

ment. In the reshuffle at the congress he became a full member of the Central Committee, a candidate-member of its Presidium, and one of its ten secretaries. It was a big jump.

The division of functions among Presidium members and Central Committee secretaries is seldom revealed officially. Little is known of the nature and extent of Brezhnev's duties on these bodies following the Nineteenth Party Congress. He was promptly replaced as first secretary of the Moldavian party by his deputy. But he remained a member of the Moldavian party bureau until June 1953, indicating that he may have retained some responsibility over the region from the Moscow level. He had also served on the credentials commission at the Nineteenth Party Congress.

Most of Stalin's additions to the Presidium and the Secretariat in 1952 were dropped in the reshuffle following his death in March 1953. Brezhnev lost his positions in both bodies, but remained a Central Committee member, and was given a substantive assignment as deputy to the chief of the main Political Administration in the Ministry of Defense. At the outset he appears to have been responsible for political control of the navy, followed later by wider responsibilities for all of the services as first deputy to the chief of the Administration. During 1953 he was promoted from his wartime rank of major general to lieutenant general. The position was nominally a drop in standing from his former party positions. In actuality, the nature of his new responsibilities, given the circumstances after Stalin's death, may have increased his value to his patron, Khrushchev.<sup>21</sup>

Success in the maneuvering among Khrushchev, Malenkov and Beria in the months after Stalin's death hinged on attitudes within the armed forces. Stalin had relied increasingly in his later years on Beria's police as an instrument of rule. The first question facing a potential successor, other than Beria, was whether it was desirable to continue this practice, and if not, what alternative method to adopt. Given the nature of Soviet power, it was obvious that the military was the only realistic alternative as an ultimate justification for the regime. And in practice, the resolution of the succession crisis revolved around the military, first in the elimination of Beria in June 1953, followed by the gradual ascendancy of Khrushchev over Malenkov in the ensuing months on a program of renewed commitment to heavy industry and a high level of defense spending.<sup>22</sup> Each of these phases required an understanding of some kind with the military leaders and an accurate assessment of attitudes within the professional officer corps. Brezhnev was well placed to report on such attitudes and could conceivably have served as a channel of communication with key military figures.

From Brezhnev's standpoint, the assignment would seem a definite plus—given, of course, the circumstance that his patron, Khrushchev, came out on top. He had refurbished and extended his connection, dating from wartime, with an important segment of the Soviet Establishment. He had significantly broadened his functional experience. And he had cushioned his setback after the death of Stalin by at least remaining in Moscow in a position offering some proximity to the reality, if not the formality, of power. As an example of technique, the episode reveals a quality displayed by Brezhnev on several occasions in his career—the ability to cut his losses in adversity, to sacrifice appearances while holding on to substantive advantages, and to come out on the winning side.

#### THE VIRGIN LANDS

From 1954 until 1956 Brezhnev returned to regional affairs as Khrushchev's viceroy in

the Central Asian Republic of Kazakhstan. The assignment was a critical decision for Khrushchev. Having recently triumphed over his principal rival, Malenkov, he had staked his political fortunes in the early spring of 1954 on a vast program of agrarian expansion popularly known as the Virgin Lands program. His purpose was to repair with one stroke a chronic and increasingly serious shortage of grain. His method was a crash expansion of the USSR's arable land by bringing under the plow for the first time vast areas of Central Asia and Siberia. The selection of Brezhnev to carry out this technically uncertain and politically risky gamble testifies to Khrushchev's assessment of his ability and personal loyalty.

By Stalin's death in 1953, the consequences of mismanagement in Soviet agriculture had reached the point where they seriously threatened the stability of the regime. During a period—from 1928 to 1953—when the number of urban consumers increased by 50 million people, gross agricultural production rose only 7 per cent and the output of livestock products actually declined. In 1953 the per capita harvest of grain products was 435 kilograms—106 kilograms less than in 1913; while the amount of marketed grain produce stood at 35,800,000 tons—2.5 million tons less than in 1940.<sup>23</sup> The consequences of this situation were an increasingly sharp struggle within Soviet society for a share in the relatively diminished supply of basic materials of which agriculture is the ultimate source, and a slow, inexorable rise of almost tidal proportions in the level of popular discontent. It was obvious to Stalin's successors that something had to be done.

Khrushchev's solution was characteristically bold and unorthodox. He simply expanded the frame of the problem by expanding the area under cultivation. To do so, he had to take risks. First, risks of a technical nature: No one knew for sure whether the areas immediately accessible for such an expansion would produce the desired results. They were grasslands occupied for centuries by nomadic herdsmen. Many scientists argued that plowing would result in a dust-bowl of colossal proportions. Second, the project involved a mass migration of Slavs into non-Slav lands of the Union. No one knew precisely what the consequences would be for the hitherto successful attempt to hold together what was in fact a multinational empire.

The job could be summed up in three words: land, men, machines. Brezhnev knew all three. He had been trained as a land-utilization expert. He had a solid background in top-level regional management of important agricultural districts. He had worked with national minorities and had coped, to Moscow's satisfaction, with the task of restructuring a predominantly non-Slav, and as yet unsocialized, social system. He knew industry; not only heavy industry, but also the machine-building industry, including those parts of it producing the agricultural machinery he would vitally need. Perhaps most important of all, he had the backing and personal confidence of Nikita Khrushchev.

He also had problems. To begin, he was not formally in charge. The man who was, P. K. Ponomarenko, was a party official whose rise and fall in the bureaucracy had paralleled Malenkov's. On February 7, 1954, Ponomarenko had been named first secretary of the Kazakh party, and Brezhnev had been named second secretary. On February 8 Malenkov had asked to be relieved as Premier of the USSR and had criticized his own performance, his self-criticism including the acceptance of responsibility for shortcomings in agriculture. Khrushchev had nominated Bulganin to replace Malenkov as Premier. We do not know where Ponomarenko stood in these changes, nor do we know anything of his relations with Brezhnev. We do know that Brezhnev applied himself effectively to

the problems at hand, and within less than a year had replaced Ponomarenko—who was relegated to a diplomatic post—as first secretary of Kazakhstan.

Brezhnev's second big problem involved Soviet nationality policy. The traditional pattern of party control in non-Slav regions of the USSR was the appointment of a native as first secretary of the local party apparatus, with a Russian as his deputy. This was the pattern in Kazakhstan, where the party leader of some years' standing, Shayakhmetov, was well entrenched. He and his Russian deputy, Afonov, had been brought to Moscow in the spring of 1954 to discuss Khrushchev's proposals. Both maintained that the projected budget of 600-650 million rubles was too low, and the expected time for results of one to two years too short.<sup>24</sup> In Shayakhmetov's case, the reservations probably reflected a deeper reservation about the social and political consequences of the project. As proposed, it involved an influx of 70,000 young people from European Russia and the Ukraine. The actual number, in terms of population transfer, could be expected to exceed this figure many times, as it in fact did. The result would be a Russification of Kazakhstan as well as a conversion of what had been a nomadic Muslim society with a Soviet veneer into a genuinely sovietized Republic based on collectivized grain farming. The consequences for the native Kazakhs, as well as their land, were immense.

Both Shayakhmetov and Afonov were purged. The Virgin Lands program was put through on schedule. Between 1954 and 1955 over 350,000 young people were moved to the Virgin Lands from Russia and the Ukraine. Over 200,000 tractors and thousands of pieces of agricultural machinery and equipment were brought in. Four hundred twenty-five state farms were created, machine tractor stations established, warehouses and grain elevators built, and thousands of miles of road and railroad constructed. In three years, over 36 million hectares of new land were brought into use.<sup>25</sup> When the regular ten-year census was taken in 1959, it showed that by that year only 29 per cent of the population in Kazakhstan were still Kazakhs; the remainder were predominantly Russian and Ukrainian.

The grain crisis was solved, at least for the moment. In 1955 the Virgin Lands project resulted in a 6 per cent increase of total Soviet grain production over the 1949-1953 average, in spite of drought conditions and a poor harvest in the Volga basin and the Ukraine.<sup>26</sup> But the solution was not permanent. By 1963 the counterproductive effects of farming steppe land had begun to tell. In November 1963 the then party leader of Kazakhstan admitted that the grain yield per hectare had fallen by half, to 3.6 centners per hectare during 1963, as against 6 in 1962 and 6.7 in 1961. Descriptions of dust-bowl conditions appeared in leading Soviet journals, and in 1964 Khrushchev, in an interview with an Italian publisher, admitted that the Virgin Lands scheme had been a "stop-gap" maneuver until some more lasting solution could be found.<sup>27</sup>

Brezhnev had demonstrated the requisite combination of managerial ability and political acumen. Had he failed in either respect, the consequences for Khrushchev might have been final. Khrushchev's struggle with Malenkov had turned on the issue of resource allocation. Malenkov had been defeated in 1954 and subsequently rusticated to a minor managerial post. But his supporters remained in the Soviet leadership until 1957. Had the Virgin Lands program failed, they would have had Khrushchev's head, and rightly so, as the man responsible for an error costing billions of rubles. The national minorities question was less apparent, but potentially of equal or greater seriousness. In the immediate post-Stalin period Beria had sought support in his struggle with Khrushchev by a policy of concessions to the national

Footnotes at end of article.

minorities. Beria was dead and gone. But non-Slavs still made up nearly half of the population of the USSR. A spectacular explosion of resentment by the displaced Kazakhs of Central Asia could have had serious repercussions not only for Khrushchev, but for the whole structure of Soviet power. At the least, it would have raised obstacles to Khrushchev's foreign policy objectives among the less developed countries, an area to which Brezhnev was now to turn.

#### HIGH OFFICE AND HEIR APPARENT

Brezhnev returned to Moscow in February 1956. Election in the same month by the Twentieth Party Congress to candidate membership in the party Presidium and assignment as a secretary to the Central Committee meant a return to the upper echelon of Soviet power. This elite, to which he had been admitted for a brief period before Stalin's death, and of which he was now again a part, numbers less than a thousand people, including dependents. Brezhnev was to remain in it, despite some ups and downs as a high-level troubleshooter for Khrushchev, for the next eight years.

De-Stalinization came in 1956 and so did its consequences in Eastern Europe—the Poznan riots, the Polish October and the Hungarian rebellion. In the fall of 1955 Tito and Khrushchev exchanged a series of visits intended, it now seems clear, to engage Tito's help in defusing the situation in Hungary. Brezhnev attended at least one of these meetings, in Yalta, together with Gero, then party leader in Hungary; Kirichenko, the Ukrainian first secretary; Furtseva, his colleague on the Presidium; and Serov, the Soviet security chief.<sup>38</sup> What role he played is unknown. Possibly he had responsibilities for cadre matters relating to the Ukraine and other western borderlands of the USSR. Or he may have been asked for advice on attitudes among the Asian communist parties, having returned in April from his first assignment abroad as head of a delegation to the North Korean party's Third Congress.

The explosion in Eastern Europe, when it came, shook the foundations of the communist world. It also shook Khrushchev. But it did not topple him. At the December 1956 Plenum of the Central Committee, his protégé, Shepilov, was dismissed as Foreign Minister. Other supporters, including those in the party apparatus, like Brezhnev, remained unscathed. Brezhnev's personal views in this affair are not known. Presumably he shared those of his chief.

Brezhnev shared in the challenges and triumphs experienced by Khrushchev in 1957. The record grain harvest of 1956 encouraged Khrushchev to push ahead with domestic reforms in spite of growing political opposition. At a February meeting of the Central Committee he announced a major decentralization of economic management through creation of regional economic councils (*Sovnarkhozy*) which had the effect of raising the role of top party organs at the expense of the authority formerly enjoyed by the central governmental organs. On March 12 he called for a crash solution to the chronic livestock problem, and on May 22 fixed a target date of 1961 for overtaking the United States in per capita production of meat and milk. The unvoiced corollary was a shift in the allocation of resources from heavy industry to agriculture. Both moves served to crystallize resentment against him in the party Presidium.

The showdown came in June. Outvoted seven to four in the Presidium, Khrushchev appealed to the Central Committee. With the help of the military he summoned a surprise meeting of the Central Committee and reversed the decision. His opponents, led by Malenkov, Molotov and Kaganovich—thereafter christened the Anti-Party Group—were

discredited and eventually eliminated from high party positions. In their place he installed, in addition to Marshal Zhukov, his associates Furtseva, Aristov, Belyaev, Brezhnev, Ignatov, Kozlov, Kuusinen, and Shvernik.<sup>39</sup>

It had been a near thing. Concessions had had to be made to the military in terms of loosened political controls, and to the heavy-industrial advocates, such as Kozlov, Suslov and Bulganin (who alone among the conspirators remained on the Presidium).

Brezhnev's role in this affair is instructive. The details of his involvement are unknown, but the significance may be inferred from one central fact: he was on the winning side, and he was on it in a situation where men with more experience than he in Presidium politics had guessed wrong. Why? Two factors suggest themselves: Brezhnev's background and the changing nature of the Soviet polity. The substantive issues involved the allocation of resources among industry, agriculture and defense. But the key to a political resolution of the problem no longer rested in the Presidium. It had shifted downward into the Central Committee, in which the balance of power is held by regional-level party leaders plus added elements from the emerging interest-group structure of Soviet society—primarily the professional military, and to a lesser extent the enterprise managers. Brezhnev knew all three, not only at the top, but also at the regional and working levels, to which political power in the USSR was now shifting.

Brezhnev's new status as full Presidium member brought a growing range of assignments. In July 1957 he is known to have taken part in meetings with Hodja, Kardelj and Rankovic; then with Zhivkov; and later with Kardelj and Rankovic.<sup>40</sup> In 1958 he was made a deputy chairman of the RSFSR Bureau, the office within the party Secretariat responsible for party affairs in Russia, as distinct from other republics of the Union.<sup>41</sup> In January 1959, at the Twenty-first Party Congress, he chaired a discussion of developments in the Virgin Lands, indicating a continuing interest in the project. It is difficult to say to what extent this pattern of assignments in foreign and domestic affairs represented a cumulative acquisition of power, and to what extent it was simply high-level troubleshooting for Khrushchev. Possibly there was a good measure of both. In either case, the effect was a significant expansion of Brezhnev's status in the power structure, a status publicly acknowledged on April 22, 1959, when he was selected to deliver the keynote address on Lenin's birthday.

Brezhnev's rising influence paralleled the political fortunes of his chief. In retrospect, Khrushchev's best year may well have been 1959. He had dominated the Twenty-first Party Congress at its outset. In April his sixty-fifth birthday had brought congratulatory tributes reminiscent of Stalin's cult of personality. Domestically, his hopes for a dramatic rise in the output of meat and dairy products were still given credence, and the diminishing returns in Kazakhstan had not yet become fully apparent. Abroad, unrest in Eastern Europe had been brought under control, relations with the West were volatile but on the upgrade, and the rift with China was still no more than a potential for trouble.

In 1960 Khrushchev's fortune changed, and so did Brezhnev's. In the Virgin Lands a diminishing rate of return had set in and difficulties were piling up. In January Brezhnev presided over the relief of his successor Belyaev, ritually charged by Brezhnev with the usual shortcomings. On May 4 the U-2 affair burst on the scene, unsettling the country and reversing a promising trend toward improved relations with the United States. Three days later the Soviet parliament, then in session, accepted the resignation of the aging Voroshilov as chief of state

and elected Brezhnev to replace him. It was not clear at the time whether the move to what was traditionally a figurehead position also involved the loss of Brezhnev's party posts. Later, it became known that the move included a reshuffle in the leading party organs, resulting within a matter of months in a loss of positions by several of Khrushchev's supporters. Brezhnev remained a Presidium member but sacrificed his post as party secretary. The beneficiaries of the shuffle, it later appeared, were Frol Kozlov, a heavy industry advocate from the Lenin-grad party apparatus, and Mikhail Suslov, a hard-line ideologist concerned with inter-party relations. Khrushchev and his Ukrainian clique were still predominant in the upper leadership. But the rosy days of 1959 were gone. Henceforward, they would face an increasingly difficult struggle requiring constant maneuver and compromise to keep afloat.

As chief of state for the next four years, Brezhnev carried a heavy schedule of ceremonial functions. The visits abroad gave him a needed awareness of noncommunist areas. (The beginning was hardly auspicious. On a trip to North Africa in January 1961 the French Air Force, then in its Algerian agony, buzzed and fired on his plane.) Later tours were less dangerous and no doubt served to widen the horizons of a man whose only previous experience of the noncommunist world had been the military landscape and war-ravaged population of Eastern Europe. In 1961 he visited Morocco, Guinea, Ghana, Sudan and India, saw Finland, and headed a delegation to Czechoslovakia. In 1962 he visited Belgrade to pave the way for another visit by Khrushchev and again headed a delegation to Czechoslovakia. In 1963 he went to Cambodia, Afghanistan, and on a state visit to Iran, and again visited Czechoslovakia. In 1964, a week before Khrushchev's fall, he represented the USSR at the fifteenth anniversary celebrations of Ulbricht's regime in East Berlin.

Other members of the Brezhnev family benefited from this exposure to the world. Mrs. Brezhnev made the trip to Iran, and the daughter, Galina, pleased the world press by appearing with her father in Belgrade dressed in the latest styles. One of the sons, Yuri, has traveled abroad as a member of foreign trade missions.

These ceremonial duties did not prevent Brezhnev from continuing to troubleshoot for Khrushchev in many areas. In May 1960 he participated in a meeting of secretaries of primary party organizations in the army and spoke forcefully on the need to carry out the decisions of an October 1957 Central Committee plenum on the restoration of Leninist norms, i.e., political control, in the army.<sup>42</sup> (The plenum had removed Marshal Zhukov from power for refusal to comply with the party's decision on political control in the armed forces.)

Rocketry and the Soviet man-in-space program also occupied Brezhnev's attention. In June 1961, two months after Gagarin completed the world's first flight in space, Brezhnev was awarded the Hero of Socialist Labor medal for "outstanding service in the development of rocket technology and the successful flight of a Soviet man in space."<sup>43</sup>

During 1962 Brezhnev rendered loyal support to Khrushchev in the mounting quarrel with China and in domestic political problems. During his visit to Belgrade in September 1962 he put forward faithfully the Khrushchev line against Chinese dogmatism and Yugoslav revisionism. In November, a month after the Cuban missile crisis, Suslov attacked Khrushchev in a Central Committee meeting as a compromiser and "companion of Chamberlain."<sup>44</sup> Brezhnev relied, in effect, at the Czechoslovak Party Congress the following month by vigorously supporting Khrushchev's personal conduct of the crisis. In the same

Footnotes at end of article.

speech he contradicted a speech made by Suslov's ally, Kozlov, the day before in which Kozlov reversed the Khrushchev line that dogmatism rather than revisionism was the main danger.<sup>45</sup>

Brezhnev's actions in the difficult times of 1960-1962 are reminiscent of his style in earlier periods of adversity. There is the same resourcefulness, the same facility in shifting into new fields of substantive interest, and the same steadfast adherence to what turned out to be the winning side.

Brezhnev's loyalty was rewarded in the following year. On May 4, 1963 Kozlov's illness was announced in *Pravda*. A Central Committee plenum scheduled for May 28, on which the conservatives grouped around Suslov and Kozlov appear to have based their hopes for ideological retrenchment, was postponed without explanation until June. Something—possibly fate—had intervened.

When the plenum met in June it restored much of the leverage Khrushchev and his Ukrainian *apparatus* had lost in May 1960. Brezhnev and a fellow member of the Ukrainian party *apparatus*, Podgorny, were assigned as Central Committee secretaries. The Secretariat, now numbering fourteen members, mostly Khrushchev supporters, exceeded the membership of the Presidium proper. The increase in responsibilities did not prevent Brezhnev from continuing to function as chief of state. In addition to trips abroad, mentioned above, he continued to appear at Moscow functions, including a reception he arranged in July for Western test-ban negotiators Averell Harriman and Lord Hallam. Concurrently, his role in Soviet domestic politics again increased. In November Khrushchev told visiting French statesman Guy Mollet that Brezhnev, Podgorny and Polyakov were his possible successors.<sup>46</sup>

Within six months Brezhnev had moved into the lead among the three heirs presumptive. On July 15, 1964 it was announced that old Bolshevik Anastas Mikoyan had replaced Brezhnev as chief of state, thus freeing the younger man "to concentrate on Party matters." His colleague Podgorny had had a year's lead on him in full-time Secretariat work. But he lacked Brezhnev's broad range of substantive experience, and he may possibly have lacked Khrushchev's preference. Podgorny, it now seems likely, was positioned by Khrushchev to serve as a "counter-heir," someone who could keep the heir from falling prey to the temptation to precipitate his own succession.<sup>47</sup>

#### LEADERSHIP, 1964-1968

Khrushchev's replacement by his protégé at a special session of the Central Committee on October 14, 1964 came suddenly, seeming to surprise the victors as much as the vanquished. The shift brought no immediate change of personalities or principles. Initial changes in policy were limited to the abolition of some of Khrushchev's innovations in economic organization and party structure. For the rest, the policy direction of the new leadership seemed more a case of not doing some of the things Khrushchev had intended to do than initiating new policies. It was not to be long before the Chinese would be calling the new mode "Khrushchevism without Khrushchev."

Changes of personnel which took place in the period 1964-1968 were gradual. When he fell Khrushchev took with him only his personal entourage. The related changes in leading party and government organs amounted to little more than filling the gaps left by Khrushchev's departure. There were no changes in the military. Beginning in 1965 a gradual, almost glacial shift in the balance of forces within the party apparatus took place in favor of Brezhnev. Podgorny, the former "counter-heir" to Brezhnev, was decorously bumped upstairs to fill the vacancy left by easing Mikoyan sideways out of his position as chief of state, and subsequently out of the

party Presidium. Somewhat later the young and excessively vigorous Shelepin was shoved downstairs by abolishing his job as chief of the powerful combined Party-State Control Commission, and later by dropping him from the Secretariat. In due course, Brezhnev supporters from the provinces, mostly former Brezhnev lieutenants, began to filter into key jobs in the Secretariat and government. In March 1966 at the Twenty-third Party Congress, Brezhnev's enhanced status was symbolically blessed by granting him the title of General Secretary of the party. The Central Committee which granted him this honor, and which in large part re-elected itself at the Congress, involved less turnover than any preceding body of its kind in the post-Stalin era.<sup>48</sup>

Changes of principle have been even less apparent. Brezhnev's substantive contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory has been nil. Existing programmatic documents whose contents were obviously irrelevant in the atmosphere of gathering conservatism, like the 1961 Party Program, were rendered perfunctory lip service for a period and then ignored. No attempt has been made to revise or refute them. Other plans involving fundamentals, like the draft constitution and the new Collective Farm Statute, have been conveniently forgotten. Brezhnev's chairmanship of the drafting commission for the new constitution, as well as an explicit commitment to produce the constitution in time for the 1967 celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Soviet power, are no longer mentioned.

After an appropriate interval Brezhnev and his colleague Kosygin embarked on a series of cautious moves designed to renovate the ramshackle structure of Soviet industry and agriculture. In March 1965 Brezhnev proposed the only major policy initiative publicly connected with his name—a rationalization and refinancing of Soviet agriculture. During the discussion, it emerged that Khrushchev's voluntarist measures to raise the productivity of Soviet agriculture in the period 1959-1964 had been in vain. Instead of a 70 per cent growth in agricultural production provided for in the then current Seven Year Plan, the actual growth had been only 10 per cent. The March 1965 plenum passed a resolution providing for the investment of 71 billion rubles in agriculture over the next five years, accompanied by a number of practical, tested measures to improve and expand the area of arable land and to raise incentives for the farmers.<sup>49</sup> The program appears to have been solidly based, and the first few years it resulted, with the help of good weather in 1966, in a perceptible improvement. In October 1967 the schedule of investment fell victim to a 25 per cent cut in order to finance higher defense costs, leaving the future of the program in some doubt. Brezhnev had nothing to say about the cuts, although his Presidium colleague Polyansky, who was responsible for agriculture, protested vociferously.<sup>50</sup>

Although Brezhnev has left the initiative in pushing through the reform of industrial management to his colleague Kosygin, he must bear the ultimate responsibility for it in his capacity as leader of the party. The program, popularly associated with the Liberman proposals for a modified form of profit-making in industry, is still only slightly more than half implemented. So far, its effectiveness has been severely curtailed by foot-dragging among conservative middle-level party officials and entrenched government bureaucrats. If the resistance continues, Brezhnev may eventually have to choose between ousting the resisters or accepting another period of decline in economic growth rates. The plain results for the first half of 1968, published in July, indicate a decline in the rate of growth of total industrial output to the lowest point since 1963.

With one exception—the dismissal of the

biologist Lysenko in February 1965—Brezhnev's cultural policies have been solidly conservative. The result has been a mounting wave of disaffection and dissent among the creative intellectuals, highlighted by the remarkable outbursts following the Sin-yavskiy-Daniel trial of 1966 and the Ginzburg trial of 1968. In 1967 an effort was made to create an atmosphere of harmony in the arts as part of the anniversary celebrations for the fiftieth anniversary of Soviet power, and both Brezhnev and Kosygin avoided any personal involvement in cultural affairs. In 1968 when the response from the liberal intellectuals showed that a wide spectrum of opinion was affected, both leaders made public statements, and a Central Committee plenum in April adopted a resolution which added up to a reformulation of official cultural policy in terms of militant orthodoxy and outright xenophobia.<sup>51</sup>

Brezhnev's major foreign policy concern from 1964 to 1968 was with the communist world, where his policy was conservative in the sense of trying to maintain things basically as they were, rather than reverting to what had been or pressing forward toward what might be. His first moves were designed to conciliate the dogmatists by arresting the sharp deterioration in interstate relations with the Chinese and reassuring Ulbricht by scrapping Khrushchev's gestures toward some form of understanding with Bonn. The nod toward the Chinese had little effect. Polemics were resumed, starting with the Chinese, who by August 1966 had regained and exceeded their earlier level of vituperation against Khrushchev. Within months the Soviets were replying at an equal level of tension, although perhaps with somewhat more decorum. In a secret letter circulated following a December 1966 meeting of the Central Committee, the case against the Chinese was given full treatment, including an exposé of Brezhnev's personal attempts to affect a reconciliation and the nature of the Chinese response.

In Eastern Europe Brezhnev sought to straddle the widening gap between the dogmatists, led by Ulbricht and Gomulka, and the revisionists in Rumania and Czechoslovakia who were intent on following or outdoing the Yugoslav example. Brezhnev succeeded in bridging this polarization by a combination of coercion and concessions until the summer of 1968, when the pace of events in Czechoslovakia reached the point of restoring a two-party system, and the Soviet military developed genuine concern at the loss of Warsaw Pact control over the Czech armed forces. In the resulting hawk-dove division within the Soviet Politbureau, Brezhnev is believed to have played a mediating, middle-of-the-road role until the crunch, when he came down on the side of intervention.

These moves had taken place against the backdrop of a continuing search for unity in the world communist movement, led by Suslov but encouraged and actively participated in by Brezhnev. Until the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the effort had centered on attempts to convene a world meeting of communist parties. Brezhnev's success in this endeavor was limited to a series of small "preparatory" meetings which at least served to keep the idea alive, but which had the disadvantage of revealing with shattering clarity the depth and extent of the fissures in the former monolith of international proletarian solidarity.

Toward the West, Brezhnev sought to maintain and exploit the divisions in NATO created by Khrushchev's popular-front policies in Western Europe and by his guarded cooperation with the United States in the search for control of nuclear weapons. There were limits to what could be done in these areas in the mid-1960's, but it is a tribute to Brezhnev's flexibility that he exploited both for all possible advantages for as long as he could. The popular-front tactic flourished

under signs of Soviet permissiveness toward Rumanian rapprochement with West Germany and during the early stages of toleration for internal liberalization in Czechoslovakia. It was set back by internal developments in France—for which Brezhnev can hardly be blamed—and at least temporarily scuttled by the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Brezhnev's American policy up to 1968 amounted to a modified version of peaceful coexistence—the modification consisting of a gradually increased emphasis on national liberation, demonstrated in the Arab-Israeli conflict and enunciated with growing frequency in the Viet Nam context; and in the use of anti-imperialist themes, primarily as a basis for his efforts to maintain some semblance of bloc unity. He did not renounce a search for cooperation with the United States in areas of mutual interest—as revealed in the August 1967 agreement on a draft non-proliferation treaty—but left the initiative to his governmental officials, notably Gromyko and Kosygin. The outstanding example, of course, was the Glassboro summit meeting between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin following the June 1967 Middle East conflict.

In considering Brezhnev's attitude toward the Third World, one gains the impression, despite his statements on Viet Nam and the Middle East, that he hoped it would go away. The impression may be unfair, but it remains a demonstrable fact that Brezhnev's involvement up to 1968 in both the triumphs and setbacks of Soviet engagement in the area was the minimum required. The Glassboro example has been cited. Brezhnev was keeping the lid on Eastern Europe from Moscow while Kosygin faced the world and the Americans at the United Nations and Glassboro. Podgorny visited Cairo, but a follow-up trip by Brezhnev to Cairo was canceled. Earlier, the successful Soviet role in mediating the India-Pakistan conflict had been left to Kosygin. On the debit side, the rift with Castro, symbolized by the polemics at the July 1967 Latin American Solidarity Conference, seems to have stirred Brezhnev, but only feebly.

Reviewing Brezhnev's first four years, one is inevitably led into comparisons with his predecessors. From the historian's standpoint the comparison is a disappointment. Brezhnev obviously lacks Lenin's charisma. He has made efforts to restore a measure of popular respect for the achievements of the Stalin era, but there is little evidence that he aspires to Stalin's personal role as a revolutionary despot. Khrushchev's Bolshevik voluntarism and flamboyant peasant populism are obviously not his style. As a subject for monumental biographies, he leaves much to be desired.

Yet by 1968 Brezhnev seemed durable, perhaps for the very reasons that Western observers rate him down. In a time of rising conservatism at home and abroad he represented familiar policies, and yet constituted a threat to no one, at least in the way his predecessors threatened and harried the society over which they ruled. To the middle-level party officials, the government bureaucracy and the professional military officers whose institutional and personal interests now shape the course of Soviet society, he had come to represent a form of stability and order long absent from their lives.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> M. Page, *The Day Khrushchev Fell* (New York: Hawthorn, 1965), p. 178.

<sup>2</sup> Bertram Wolfe, "The Durable Core of Totalitarianism," in S. Handel and R. Braham, editors, *The USSR After 50 Years: Promise and Reality* (New York: Knopf, 1967).

<sup>3</sup> L. Pietromarchi, *The Soviet World* (New York: Barnes, 1965), p. 97.

<sup>4</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, the basic biographic data on Brezhnev are taken from the *Bo'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, Yezhegodnik* (Soviet Encyclopedia Yearbook), editions of 1958, 1961, 1962, 1965 and 1966. A

more recent version is in *Kommunist: Kalendar Spravochnik*, 1968 (Moscow: Politizdat, 1967). None of these sketches covers more than half a page, and there are some significant differences among them to which I have drawn attention at the appropriate places.

<sup>5</sup> "Tomorrow is Three Suits," *Time*, February 21, 1964.

<sup>6</sup> "Not everyone is aware of it—although it has been mentioned in the press—but Comrade Brezhnev's brother, a specialist in metallurgical engineering, has worked for a long time at the Lenin Foundry here, helping our specialists, our working class, in assembling the plant and in the effective operations of this great combine." W. Gomułka, speaking in October 1964, as cited by Page, *The Day Khrushchev Fell*, p. 144.

<sup>7</sup> E. H. Carr, *The Bolshevik Revolution: 1917-1923* (New York: Penguin Books, Pelican edition, 1962), II, 295, 296.

<sup>8</sup> As cited in K. Kellen, *Khrushchev: A Political Portrait* (New York: Praeger, 1961), p. 35.

<sup>9</sup> L. Schapiro, *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1960), pp. 378-390.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 435-439.

<sup>11</sup> M. Fainsod, *How Russia Is Ruled* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. 244, 245.

<sup>12</sup> Yu. Platakov, as cited in Schapiro, *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, p. 381.

<sup>13</sup> H. F. Achminov, *Breschnev und Kosygin: die Neuen Manner im Kreml?* (Diessen/Ammerssee: W. V. Tucker, 1964).

<sup>14</sup> *Bo'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya* (Second edition), XIV, 574, 575.

<sup>15</sup> L. Plastrak, *The Grand Tactician: Khrushchev's Rise to Power* (New York: Praeger, 1961), pp. 57-67.

<sup>16</sup> Information on Brezhnev's wife and children is scanty, but the little there is tends to be consistent. I have used Page, *The Day Khrushchev Fell*, pp. 180-181, as a handy summary.

<sup>17</sup> B. N. Ponomarev, editor, *Politicheskii Slovar'* (Second edition; Moscow: Politizdat, 1958), p. 56.

<sup>18</sup> J. Armstrong, *The Soviet Bureaucratic Elite: A Case Study of the Ukrainian Apparatus* (New York: Praeger, 1959), p. 6.

<sup>19</sup> Khrushchev's rule in the Ukraine is relatively well documented. I have relied on Kellen, *Khrushchev: A Political Portrait*, and Plastrak, *The Grand Tactician*.

<sup>20</sup> N. Ponomarev, editor, *Istoriia Kommunisticheskoi Partii Sovetskogo Soiuza* (Moscow: Politizdat, 1959), p. 526.

<sup>21</sup> *Sovetskii Dagestan*, No. 5, 1967, p. 31.

<sup>22</sup> *Istoriia Velikoi Otechestvennoi Voiny*, six volumes (Moscow: Voenizdat, 1960-1965), III, 95.

<sup>23</sup> *New York Times*, August 4, 1968, p. 3.

<sup>24</sup> *Istoriia Velikoi Otechestvennoi Voiny*, V, 301.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 304.

<sup>26</sup> Emigré source to author. Official biographies indicate that Brezhnev served as a political officer in a military district at the end of the war, but they do not state which one.

<sup>27</sup> Achminov, *Breschnev und Kosygin*, pp. 35, 36.

<sup>28</sup> L. P. Repida, "Poebeda Sotsializma v Moldavii," in S. P. Trapeznikov, editor, *Istoriia Moldavskoi SSR* (Kishinev: Kartea Moldovenskaia, 1968), II, 579-580.

<sup>29</sup> A. L. Odud, *Moldavskaya SSR* (Moscow: Geografizdat, 1955), p. 70.

<sup>30</sup> Schapiro, *The Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, pp. 519, 520.

<sup>31</sup> R. Kolkowicz, *The Soviet Military and the Communist Party* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), p. 244.

<sup>32</sup> Fainsod, *How Russia Is Ruled*, p. 482, summarizes the main elements in the situation.

<sup>33</sup> S. Ploss, *Conflict and Decision Making in Soviet Russia: A Case Study of Agricultural Policy, 1953-1963* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965), pp. 27, 75.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 86.

<sup>35</sup> Ponomarev, *Istoriia KPSS*, 1959 edition, p. 634.

<sup>36</sup> Ploss, *Conflict and Decision Making in Soviet Russia*, p. 97.

<sup>37</sup> R. Conquest, *Russia After Khrushchev* (New York: Praeger, 1965), p. 91.

<sup>38</sup> Tito's account of the meeting is in *Borba*, November 16, 1956. An English translation is in P. Zimmer, editor, *National Communism and Popular Revolt in Eastern Europe* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957).

<sup>39</sup> M. Fainsod, "What Happened to Collective Leadership?" in *Russia Under Khrushchev: An Anthology from "Problems of Communism"* (New York: Praeger, 1962), p. 109, 110.

<sup>40</sup> *Pravda*, July 19, 1957; *New York Times*, July 19, 1957.

<sup>41</sup> *Soviet Encyclopedia Yearbook*, 1966.

<sup>42</sup> Yu. P. Petrov, *Partinoe Stroitel'stvo v Sovetskoi Armii i Flote, 1918-1961* (Moscow: Voenizdat, 1964), pp. 497, 498.

<sup>43</sup> *Soviet Encyclopedia Yearbook*, 1962.

<sup>44</sup> Pietromarchi, *The Soviet World*, p. 102.

<sup>45</sup> *Pravda*, December 6, 1962, cited in C. Linden, *Khrushchev and the Soviet Leadership: 1957-1964* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1966), p. 163.

<sup>46</sup> F. Stevens, *U.S. News and World Report*, April 27, 1964.

<sup>47</sup> For a discussion of this concept, see M. Rush, *Political Succession in the USSR* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965).

<sup>48</sup> H. Schwartz, "Brezhnev Packs New Central Committee with Supporters from Dnieper," *New York Times*, August 15, 1966.

<sup>49</sup> A. Avtorkhanov, *The Communist Party Apparatus* (Chicago: Regnery, 1966), p. 289.

<sup>50</sup> *Kommunist*, cited in the *New York Times*, October 29, 1967.

<sup>51</sup> P. A. Smith, Jr., "Protest in Moscow," *Foreign Affairs*, October 1968.

## ON PRESIDENT NIXON'S FORTHCOMING VISIT TO RED CHINA AND SOVIET UNION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Leon F. Nadrowski, an executive member of the Greenpoint-Williamsburg Young Republicans and vice president of the Congress Republican Club, wrote to the President last month making suggestions that I believe were quite timely and worth serious evaluation. I am not aware, of course, as to whether the White House staff gave this letter more than normal attention, but I do believe it is worth making available to my colleagues by inserting it into the RECORD.

Dr. Nadrowski's letter follows:

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

December 6, 1971.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,  
White House  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am sure most Americans accept your visits to communist China and the Soviet Union favorably in so far as penetrating the bamboo and iron curtains can be of historical significance and benefit to the free West.

However, there is some reservation in view of the fact that the free world has witnessed folly after folly in America's foreign policy commencing from World War II and resulting in the loss of more than half the world under communist tyranny and oppression whether it be behind the iron curtain or the bamboo curtain.

There is very little reason not to believe that the rest of the world will fall under communism if we continue to perpetuate the

same foreign policy of appeasement. This tragically may even provoke World War III. "Peaceful coexistence" as propagandized by the communists under their terms means eventual subjugation of the entire world under their system.

The finest hour for the free world however can emanate from your visits to Red China and the Soviet Union.

It is sincerely hoped that you will challenge all communists throughout the world to "universal freedom" as a requisite for "peaceful coexistence" which was successfully coined by Khrushchev in 1956.

Communism as it stands today, in essence provides a gun to the head of all the people under its yoke to protect them from freedom.

Your visits to Red China and the Soviet Union extending the hand of friendship of all Americans to the Chinese and Russian people with a peaceful challenge to promulgate all the freedoms will reverberate throughout the entire world.

What peoples could refuse freedom of speech, press, religion, elections, freedom from want and fear?

This will be a dramatic contrast to the image of a sabre rattling imperialist America that the communists have created for their people to believe.

If you fail in your visits to Red China and the Soviet Union to promote this great gesture of peace with freedom to all in the world you will have failed in your mission and failed everyone.

If you can envision the overwhelming impact of such a freedom offensive, then, as many have related to me you will have enthusiastic support for re-election as President of the United States.

Most of all, if you promote this freedom challenge to the communist world in order to foment constant persuasion for the eventual dissolution of communist tyranny and oppression wherever it may be, then you shall go down in history as a great champion of freedom on this planet.

Respectfully,

LEON F. NADROWSKI, M.D.

#### GEORGE WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CELEBRATES ITS 50TH YEAR

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend warmest congratulations to the students, teachers, and officials of the George Washington Elementary School which is this week celebrating its 50th anniversary. Throughout its existence, George Washington has provided young people of its area with quality education, one which has prepared them well for the challenges of life. Miss Mildred Pelikan, its principal, and all of those associated with George Washington Elementary School can certainly be proud of its fine record.

I insert into the RECORD an article from the West Side Sun which tells the history of the school and describes the celebration being planned by Mrs. Ruth Schneider, an active school parent.

The article follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CELEBRATES ITS 50TH YEAR

(By Denise Rochford)

When Mrs. James Schneider of Oxford Avenue presides at the 50th anniversary cele-

OXVIII—91—Part 2

bration of George Washington School next week, it will be with a touch of nostalgia.

When she was an elementary school student named Ruth Russ, she attended George Washington. Now she has two children at the school, and a third that is now in junior high.

For the anniversary meeting on Tuesday January 25th, she has arranged for Supt. of Schools Dr. Paul Briggs to be the guest speaker. It will be a special meeting, because fathers are also invited and will conduct the evening session beginning at 7:30 p.m.

George Washington, at 16510 Lorain Avenue, was constructed in 1921, when West Park was a city separate from Cleveland; The school opened in September of 1922 combining all grades through the eighth.

In January of 1923, when West Park was annexed to the City of Cleveland, Geo. Washington became a part of the Cleveland Public School system.

Its first principal, was Mrs. W. J. Featherstone. Under the supervision of the Cleveland schools, Miss Carrie Buettner was named principal in Sept. of 1923.

Miss Mildred Pelikan who has been principal since 1957, is the ninth administrator of the school.

Mrs. Schneider has spent some time gathering facts and figures about the 50 year existence of the school, and will present the information at the anniversary celebration.

Some of the improvements that have been implemented during the past 50 years will be discussed, including new doors, acoustical gym ceiling, new lighting. But the biggest change in the school during that time, was just completed last week, in time for the Open House.

The teacher's lounge, which dated back to the original, was just remodeled, including new dropped ceiling and lighting and a general updating of the facilities (which were outmoded to the point of wooden drainboards).

All the faculty is delighted with the new cheery quarters and anxious to show it off following the PTA meeting.

Population of the school has not changed drastically over the years. When the school joined Cleveland in 1923, there were 383 students through the eighth grade. Currently there are 380 students through the sixth grade. The largest number of students amounted to about 500 during the early 1940's, according to school records.

A parents organization was started in 1922, and its president was Mrs. J. C. Fisher. In 1925 the group joined the Congress of Mothers Affiliation with the National PTA group followed. Mrs. Leo Humphrey, of Riveredge, one of the early PTA presidents is expected to attend the celebration. She has been active for years, and attends every Founder's Day at the school.

Results of an interesting questionnaire will be unveiled at the meeting. Mrs. Schneider has asked all parents to respond answering how many of them attended Geo. Washington school as students. She thinks that the results will prove many former students stayed on and raised their families in the old neighborhood, as she did.

#### FEDERAL OFFICIALS DISREGARD PURCHASE OF .22 HANDGUN AMMUNITION BY FELONS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have previously outlined the reasons for my firm opposition to H.R. 3599 (CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD, vol. 117, pt. 33, pp. 43183-43184), legislation reported by the Ways and Means Committee which would exempt .22 caliber ammunition from the recordkeeping requirements of the 1968 Federal Gun Control Act. In view of the claims being made on behalf of that legislation, I recently undertook, and am continuing, an investigation of the use of these ammunition sales records. My findings to date, further, convince me that no legislation such as this should be brought before the House without full hearings, and if brought before the House should be defeated.

As the Members of this House are well aware, The Federal Gun Control Act of 1968 prohibits convicted felons and other obviously dangerous individuals from purchasing or obtaining any kind of guns or ammunition. To help enforce that prohibition so far as ammunition is concerned, the Congress required that records be kept of all sales of ammunition usable in handguns.

In recent weeks, my staff and I visited and contacted gun shops in the New York City area. From their ammunition sales records, we picked at random 90 names of individuals who purchased .22 caliber ammunition—which is usable in both handguns and longguns. We asked the FBI to check on those 90 individuals, and we were informed that 23 of them—26 percent—have FBI criminal records. Of those, eight are clearly convicted felons—three of them having been convicted of crimes involving guns.

The Treasury and Justice Departments, who have enforcement responsibilities here, have insisted that records of this type are useless and have refused even to look at them. The Ways and Means Committee Report on H.R. 3599 implies that, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statement cited above I included excerpts of letters I have received from those Departments in which they repeat that position.

My investigation shows these records are not useless. It shows they could, if appropriately examined and used, lead to the arrest and prosecution of dangerous individuals before they have a chance to use their illegally obtained ammunition to commit crimes against innocent citizens. It suggests that, by ignoring these records, the administration in Washington has failed to make full use of the laws to protect the public against crime, and thereby has subjected the public to needless danger.

In the course of my investigation, I talked to a number of gunshop owners who had no idea that Federal law prohibits purchase of handgun ammunition by convicted felons and other dangerous persons. When I informed them of that, they seemed considerably less skeptical about these records. That skepticism on the part of gun dealers, as well as legitimate sportsmen, would be even further reduced if these records were properly used to apprehend individuals who have no business obtaining ammunition, rather than gathering dust on gunshop shelves as they now are.

Lest anyone think that .22 caliber handguns are exclusively "sporting weapons," it should be noted that .22

caliber handguns were used in 2,882 murders last year alone according to FBI estimates.

With that in mind, I have appealed to Secretary of the Treasury Connally and U.S. Attorney General Mitchell to begin examining handgun ammunition sales records rigorously and systematically, especially in high-crime urban areas, and—on the basis of the valuable information my study shows these records contain—to begin prosecuting dangerous individuals who are obtaining ammunition illegally. I have also urged them to oppose any legislation in the Congress, including H.R. 3599, that would repeal handgun ammunition recordkeeping requirements. By refusing to use these records, the administration, in effect, has encouraged the forces in Congress who are behind the repeal effort and who are attempting, bit by bit, to gut existing Federal gun control laws, mild as they are.

Mr. Speaker, I have also urged Chairman Celler to convene hearings in the coming months to review more fully the administration's enforcement of existing Federal Gun Control Laws. Such hearings are essential if the House is to act judiciously on H.R. 3599 or any similar proposal.

The National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy has announced its intention to encourage citizens around the country to go out and examine these ammunition sales records in their own communities, and I am giving my full support to these efforts. These records should then be checked against Federal, State, and local records of convicted criminals, addicts, and other dangerous individuals—as defined by the 1968 Act—and I intend to assist in every way possible to see that those checks are made. The results will be sent to the Justice and Treasury Departments until those agencies begin fully meeting their responsibilities in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, a more detail statement on my recent investigation, and copies of letters to Treasury Secretary Connally, Attorney General Mitchell, and Chairman Celler follow:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JONATHAN BINGHAM (D-NY) RELEASING THE RESULTS OF AN INVESTIGATION REVEALING SALES OF HANDGUN AMMUNITION TO CONVICTED FELONS, AT A NEWS CONFERENCE, THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1972

As you may recall, the 1968 Federal Gun Control Act prohibits convicted felons from receiving, possessing, or transporting guns or ammunition in interstate commerce. To help enforce that prohibition, the '68 law contains a provision that requires a record to be kept of all gun sales, and sales of all ammunition used in handguns.

For the past two years, a bill has been brought to the floor of the House to terminate the recordkeeping requirement for .22-caliber rimfire ammunition, which can be used in both handguns and longguns, on grounds such records are useless and bothersome. Although it passed the House in 1970, that bill has not yet been enacted. But it is likely to be brought up again shortly in the House, and it has prompted me to take a close look at the use to which these ammunition sales records have been put in the fight against crime. I am prepared to report some results of that investigation.

Early last year, I asked the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, each

of whom has responsibilities for particular aspects of gun law enforcement, to report to me the extent to which ammunition sales records—particularly .22 caliber sales records—are examined and investigated by Federal officials, and the extent to which they are being used to prosecute felons and other individuals prohibited by Federal law from receiving ammunition.

The Treasury reported that the Internal Revenue Service is "unable to process or check individual ammunition sales records in any meaningful way," nor are any efforts planned to do so. Federal officials have not even required these records to be forwarded or reported to Federal agencies. They simply remain, gathering dust, in the 150,000 gun shops around the country where they are compiled.

The Department of Justice reported that it has made no attempt to use any records of .22 caliber ammunition purchases in the prosecution of suspected criminal activity.

Both Departments take the position that controls on ammunition sales simply are not effective as a law enforcement tool because the records are voluminous, ammunition "cannot be traced from manufacturer or sale to use," and, therefore, the manpower effort and expense necessary to examine the records "would not be justified by the results that may reasonably be expected through enforcement of these controls."

(Copies of the letters from Treasury and Justice containing this information are here and available for inspection).

The evidence used to initiate prosecutions of felons for receipt or possession of ammunition or a gun, when such prosecutions are made at all, is generally the fact that a felon has been charged with using the ammunition or weapon in the commission of a further crime. Possession of the weapon or ammunition is an additional charge tacked on as an afterthought. So far as I have been able to discover, however, there are no cases where, on the basis of an examination of sales records required to be kept by law, a felon or other dangerous individual (as defined in the law) was discovered to have received ammunition, and an arrest and prosecution was made simply on that basis before the felon had an opportunity to use that ammunition to commit a crime of violence. That, of course, is what should and must be done if the intent of Congress in enacting these laws is to be carried out, and if these laws are to be fully employed to protect the public.

Since I could find no evidence that any Federal law enforcement agency is bothering even to look at these records, I decided to examine some of them myself. In the past several weeks, members of my staff and I visited and contacted gun shops in the New York City area. From their ammunition sales records, we picked at random the names and addresses of 90 individuals who had purchased .22 caliber rimfire ammunition in recent months (the law requires the name, address, age, and form of identification used by the purchaser to be logged.)

Since the major purpose of the record-keeping requirement is to identify convicted felons who may be obtaining guns and ammunition, I requested the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Washington to check the 90 names and addresses on our list against the FBI's file of individuals with serious criminal records. The FBI complied, and I have the results. Those results, I think, show the considerable potential of these sales records in combatting crime, and the danger and foolishness of the Administration's policy of ignoring them. They indicate that large numbers of felons are, in fact, receiving handgun ammunition illegally by simply purchasing over the counter, and the Federal government is doing nothing about it.

Of the 90 names on the list, the FBI found 23 with records of arrest or conviction—an astonishing 26%. Of these 23, eight individ-

uals have been convicted of crimes punishable by a year or more in prison—three of them having committed crimes while armed. Two others appear to belong in this felony category, but cannot definitely be so listed without additional information on the disposition of these cases. Two individuals, including one of the eight convicted felons, appear to be "unlawful users" of drugs. Records of the remaining twelve individuals show arrests without convictions, or arrests and convictions for relatively minor offenses.

This is, only the tip of the iceberg. I have so far examined only .22 ammunition sales. .22 ammunition was used in 2,882 murders last year alone (a .22 caliber pistol was also used to kill Robert F. Kennedy). But heavier ammunition is even more commonly used in violent crimes with handguns, and it is likely that sales records of this heavier ammunition will reveal even more frequent purchases by convicted felons. And felons aren't the only group of individuals prohibited from receiving ammunition—the law also prohibits drug users, mental defectives, and fugitives doing so.

Finally, of course, my survey involved only a few gun shops in the New York City area. But the survey indicated that, across the nation, large numbers of dangerous individuals are buying ammunition illegally.

It also shows that in every city and town, sales records exist that could be used to arrest and prosecute these dangerous individuals and get them off the streets before they use the ammunition they have illegally obtained in a crime of violence against yet another victim.

It shows that the current Administration in Washington is subjecting the public to unnecessary danger by failing to make full use of existing Federal gun laws in the fight against crime. The Administration has stubbornly ignored a major legal tool which, if used, could have—and could still—prevent significant numbers of violent crimes. Rather than employing ammunition sales records as a "cutting edge" in the fight against violent crime, it has used them incidentally. Furthermore, by insisting that these records are useless in law enforcement, the Administration in effect has been encouraging anti-gun control forces in the Congress that are attempting, bit by bit, to gut the Federal gun laws.

With this in mind, I am today directing letters to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Connally, and the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Mitchell, urging them to do several things.

Most importantly, I am urging Treasury to institute regular examination and investigation of ammunition sales records of the type I have demonstrated here, at least on a spot-check basis focusing on gun shops in high-crime urban areas.

I am urging the Treasury Department to further investigate the particular purchases I discovered to have been made by apparent felons for possible prosecutions, and to report their findings and disposition of the cases to me.

I am urging the Justice Department to give high priority to prosecutions on the basis of future regular Treasury investigations of ammunition sales.

I am urging them actively to oppose, on behalf of the Administration, all efforts in the Congress to repeal handgun ammunition recordkeeping requirements.

In addition, I plan to work with the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, represented here this morning by its Executive Director, Mr. David Steinberg, to encourage citizens to visit gun shops to examine handgun ammunition and gun sales records. I stand ready to assist them in any way necessary to see that these records are checked against state, local, and Federal records of criminals, addicts, fugitives, and mental incompetents. The results of those checks will be sent to the Justice and Treas-

ury Departments until those agencies begin fully meeting their responsibilities in this matter.

Finally, I am urging Chairman Emmanuel Celler of the House Judiciary Committee, and Senator Bayh of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to convene hearings in the near future on Administration enforcement of the 1968 gun control act.

—  
JUSTICE DEPARTMENT  
GUN CONTROL,  
January 6, 1972.

HON. JOHN MITCHELL,  
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am enclosing a letter and statement I have sent to Secretary Connally containing the results of an investigation I conducted which reveals that large numbers of individuals with felony and other records of irresponsible behavior are currently purchasing handgun ammunition despite Federal laws prohibiting such persons from receiving or transporting guns and ammunition in interstate commerce, and that the Federal government is doing nothing about it. This finding is based on a comparison of records of ammunition purchases in the New York City area with FBI crime records.

I trust you will agree with me that failure fully to employ records of ammunition sales as a basis for prosecutions of felons and other irresponsible individuals for "receipt" constitutes a severe gap and failure in efforts by law enforcement officials to curb violent crime, and that your Department will give high priority to any cases of this kind referred to it by the Treasury Department for prosecution.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM.

JANUARY 6, 1972.

HON. JOHN CONNALLY,  
Secretary of the Treasury, Treasury Department, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY CONNALLY: As you may know, the Treasury Department has refrained from any systematic or regular examination and investigation of records of handgun ammunition sales required to be kept under Article 923 (g) of the Federal Firearms Act. Furthermore, the Department has taken the position that it is unable to process or check ammunition sales records in "any meaningful way," and that to do so "would not be justified by the results that may reasonably be expected through enforcement of these controls." This posture was articulated to me in a letter from your General Counsel, Mr. Samuel R. Pierce, Jr., dated February 8, 1971 (copy enclosed).

By taking this position, the Treasury Department has strengthened efforts in the Congress to repeal recordkeeping requirements for .22 caliber rimfire ammunition, which is commonly used in handguns, as well as longguns. In addition, the Justice Department, citing your position, has reported to me that it has not attempted to bring prosecutions on the basis of ammunition sales records against felons and other categories of individuals prohibited by Federal law [18 U.S.C. 922 (g) and (h)] from receiving, possessing, or transporting guns and handguns ammunition.

I have recently conducted a limited investigation of records of .22 caliber ammunition purchases in the New York City area. The detailed results of that study, and my views on it, are contained in the enclosed statement. Most significantly, I found that, of a sample of 90 individuals who purchased such ammunition, 12 had FBI records showing arrests and convictions for offenses making their ammunition purchase a probable violation of Federal law. This suggests that your Department's current practice of ignoring such records is most ill-advised and is creating a dangerous gap in one of the

most critical aspects of our national offensive against violent crime—keeping guns and ammunition out of the hands of clearly irresponsible individuals.

With this in mind, I want to urge you strongly to reverse the present practice of your Department in this area by instructing the Internal Revenue Service:

1. To investigate further the particular purchases of .22 caliber ammunition which my investigation shows were made by individuals who apparently have felony records, and to refer all findings to the Justice Department for possible prosecutions.

2. To institute regular examinations and investigation of ammunition sales records, at least to the extent of spot-checking record entries, particularly from gun shops in high-crime urban areas, against Federal records of known felons, fugitives, mentally incompetent persons, and narcotics users.

3. To direct and provide for the forwarding of ammunition sales records (or copies thereof) to a central repository in the Treasury Department to be organized and computerized so that they can be examined and used for law enforcement purposes easily and efficiently.

4. To convey promptly to the Justice Department for further investigation and prosecution the records of ammunition purchases made by any individual in apparent violation of Federal law.

5. To oppose, on behalf of your Department and the Administration, any further efforts in the Congress to repeal handgun ammunition recordkeeping requirements, including specifically H.R. 3559, now pending before the House of Representatives.

In my judgment, these proposed actions are fully within your authority under current statute. If, however, you determine that additional funds or legal authority are required to pursue the course I have recommended, I trust you will so advise me so that I may join you in seeking enactment of appropriate legislation.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM.

JANUARY 7, 1972.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CELLER: I want to draw your attention to the results of an investigation I have conducted indicating that large numbers of felons are receiving handgun ammunition illegally by simply purchasing it over the counter, and that the Executive branch is doing nothing about it. My views on the matter, and the detailed findings of my investigation, are contained in the enclosed statement.

This apparent default in Executive branch enforcement responsibilities seems to me to argue strongly for hearings more fully to review enforcement of the gun control legislation enacted by Congress in 1968. I want to urge you to give serious consideration to convening such hearings before your Committee in the near future. I would, of course, be happy to participate in any way that might be helpful.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM.

McGOVERN STILL SUPPORTS  
SCHOOL BUSING COURT DECISIONS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it has been erroneously reported that Senator

GEORGE McGOVERN was on the brink of announcing his opposition to the recent school busing decisions of the Federal courts. So that the record will be perfectly clear on where Senator McGOVERN stands on this issue, I would like to call attention to his statement of yesterday in which he emphatically reaffirms his commitment to the integration of the public schools and his support of the busing decisions. He is to be commended for his straightforwardness and candor, as the following statement indicates:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR GEORGE McGOVERN

The report that I am considering opposing the school busing orders of federal courts, or the recent decision consolidating school districts in Richmond, Virginia, is totally without foundation. All of my political life I have fought for the principle and the practice of integrated schools, based on simple justice and the unanimous view of all who have studied the problem that integrated education is better for the children and the community. I will not change that position, regardless of the political cost.

I believe that school busing and redistricting, as ordered by the federal courts, are among the prices we are paying for a century of segregation in our housing patterns. For more than a generation, black children were bused to avoid integrated schools. One of the more cynical aspects of our present debate is that President Nixon, seeking to make political capital of this difficult situation, is ignoring history and asking the nation to believe this problem began yesterday.

We would be better served if the President announced, as I have, that he intends to enforce the law, and not turn Americans against their neighbors on this issue. Then we could all turn our attention to the real problem, which is how to achieve quality education at the end of the bus line and neighborhood schools in neighborhoods in which every American can live.

## THE NIXON PRESIDENCY

HON. RICHARD W. MALLARY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. MALLARY. Mr. Speaker, I have an editorial from the Burlington, Vt., Free Press which places in proper perspective President Nixon's efforts and accomplishments on both domestic and international levels. In its conclusion, the editorial states:

The integrity, the intelligence, the inspiration and the human concern of Richard M. Nixon have given America a Presidential leadership of uncommon excellence.

I enter the entire editorial with the belief that this positive and realistic attitude concerning America today is worthy of our consideration:

## THE NIXON PRESIDENCY

Our Nation is being led by a President of great courage and extraordinary vision. Richard M. Nixon deserves the strong support and the heartfelt thanks of the American people for the victories he has brought, and the victories he is struggling against great odds to bring, for the betterment of humankind.

Yet too often these days we read "intellectual" anti-Nixon criticism—most of it snide, grossly unwarranted, and some approaching the obscene. There are people who are so full of hatred, apparently, that they cannot grasp simple facts, they cannot give any credit

whatever where great credit is obviously due, they distort history to their own prejudices, and they commit intellectual violence on the Nixon Presidency in so many other ways.

Less than three years ago Richard Nixon inherited a raging war in Southeast Asia, and it cannot be denied that within a few months the American involvement there will be merely one-tenth or less what it was. This nearly impossible task could have been achieved only by a leader of remarkable fortitude and unassailable trust. Yet what do the anti-Nixon critics say? "He was lucky and he had time," they sneer. Sure, and how much luck and how much time were involved in getting us into Vietnam during the two previous administrations?

Also inherited by Richard Nixon was an economy terribly inflated by the "guns and butter" spending policies of his predecessors. And so again with demonstration of great courage, he took the unprecedented step of ordering wage and price controls. Yet what do the anti-Nixon critics say and do? They charge him with the unemployment created by the inflation, and the greedy among them refuse to cooperate in the anti-inflation battle.

The historic and supreme accomplishments of the Nixon Presidency also include the overtures to Communist China, the pending Presidential visits to that land and to Soviet Russia, and the determined prevention of a devastating war in the Middle East.

On the domestic front, Richard Nixon has proposed a revolutionary reform of the welfare system, and he has multiplied many times over the expenditures for prison reform and for a host of other vital programs for which he is given scant credit. He has dramatically reduced the military budget, too far in our opinion, and he has sought to make government more responsive to the people in all areas.

He must be doing a lot that's right, for both the liberals and the conservatives are outspokenly antagonistic toward his leadership. The liberals are angry because the President has achieved where they only theorize, and the conservatives are angry because the President is too modern and too practical.

Unquestionably, Richard Nixon has accomplished more in his short Presidency than any other leader could possibly have achieved under the circumstances. We can only guess how much more he could accomplish for his constituency if he and the Congress were of the same political affiliation!

The anti-Nixon critics, in seeming desperation, now are resorting to dishonest tactics in their attempts to cut short his Presidency. We note, especially, the campaign finance provisions of the tax cut bill. These tactics are not only dishonest—they insult the intelligence of every fair-minded American.

But the Nixon Presidency will survive the cheap shots of its opponents. It has accomplished so much, and it can achieve so much more.

The integrity, the intelligence, the inspiration and the human concern of Richard M. Nixon have given America a Presidential leadership of uncommon excellence. We salute him, and we herewith pledge our continued support.—F.B.S.

#### LESSONS IN PREPAREDNESS

#### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record the outstanding address by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover which he

gave to the New York chapter of the American Ordnance Association on the occasion of being awarded its newly established Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves Gold Medal. Admiral Rickover is most deserving of this high honor and was cited for his creative contributions to the development of nuclear propulsion.

Admiral Rickover's address to the American Ordnance Association contains some hard facts of life that should be read by all Americans.

The address follows:

#### LESSONS IN PREPAREDNESS

(By Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover)

There is today a division of opinion among the American people regarding the necessity of reinforcing our military strength. In judging between conflicting views on this matter, the deciding factor must be their relevance to the world as it is, not as we would wish it to be. Granted the hideousness of modern war, can we deduce therefrom that mankind is now wise enough to forego recourse to arms?

A look at history should put us on guard against those who claim that humanity has now reached a state where, in formulating national policy, the possibility of armed aggression can be safely disregarded.

I am reminded of the intense opposition to the Navy's 15-cruiser bill in 1929. It was argued by many that with the signing of the Kellogg Peace Pact the year before, it was no longer necessary to build new warships—this in light of the lessons of World War I, which had erupted despite the various Hague peace treaties.

These ships were of inestimable value in helping us win World War II. The war itself was prolonged because Congress—heeding the "merchants of death" argument—prohibited shipment of war materials to Britain and France in 1939.

Then, too, weight must be given to the credentials of those propounding opposite views. Are they public servants charged with the awesome responsibility to secure our country against foreign conquest? Or are they private individuals not accountable to anyone for the consequences of their opinions—private individuals who feel free to express their personal abhorrence of war and to agitate, within the screen of rhetoric, for a reduction of the financial burden that military preparedness imposes on the taxpayer?

Would the majority of the electorate accept their argument that, given our unmet domestic needs, we cannot afford an effective defense position vis-a-vis our potential adversaries? Or that war is so horrible that it is better to suffer defeat than to fight?

There can surely be no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the American people are opposed to relinquishment of our defense capability, recognizing full well that there will then be no one left to prevent a takeover by Communist power.

Whether one accepts the optimistic view that a permanent East-West détente can be negotiated, or the pessimistic view that ultimately we shall have to fight for our liberties, this Nation has no future if it allows itself to be outmatched militarily.

As for the high cost of preparedness, the approximately \$70 billion allocated to defense for fiscal 1971 was the smallest percentage of our gross national product in 20 years—just 7 per cent. Defense expenditures in that fiscal year represented about 35 per cent of our total Federal budget outlays, compared with 44 per cent in fiscal 1969. Omitting the costs of the Vietnam war and allowing for inflation, our armed forces have less buying power today than they had two decades ago.

In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, resources have been diverted from the farm sector to defense, and there appears to be

increasing preoccupation with national security. And remember that actual war costs absorb but a small portion of Soviet expenditures, while we are spending many billions of dollars a year in Vietnam. As for myself, I would rather be alive at 10 per cent than dead at 7 per cent.

If history teaches anything it is surely that weakness invites attack; that it takes but one aggressor to plunge the world into war against the wishes of dozens of peace-loving nations, if the former is militarily strong and the latter are not.

Yet there are those who deprecate the need to maintain military supremacy, or at least parity, with the Communist empires, on the grounds that other nations have accepted a decline from first to second or third rank and that we ourselves for most of our history were militarily a second-rate power yet secure enough within our borders.

They forget that we then profited from the *Pax Britannica*, even as the former great powers of Europe who have lost their defense capability enjoy political freedom today only because we are strong enough to defend them and are ready to do so.

What it means to be weak and without American protection should be evident to all who observed the tragic drama of Czechoslovakia "negotiating" with Russia the continuing subjugation of her people.

The concept that a "weapons race" is the cause of war was a widely held theory prior to World War I. Many historical studies of the cause of that war have disproved this fallacy. And certainly it cannot be claimed that World War II was caused by an armaments race. In fact that war might well have been prevented had Britain, France, and the United States been better prepared.

It was for this very reason that at the end of World Wars I and II we vowed never again to be caught unprepared. Whether or not to use our military forces is decided by our civilian leaders, not by the military. The military is asked for advice, but the decision is that of the civilian leadership.

Our Navy is not a direct threat to any country. Its strength lies in its ability to be deployed rapidly at distances from the United States. Its very existence as a "fleet in being" serves to deter those who might otherwise think lightly about starting hostilities.

Many valuable lessons for today can be drawn from our experiences in past wars. For example, when Germany decided to invade Russia in 1941, their staff studies showed that the Soviet Union would be defeated in 8 weeks—10 at most. Our military attaché in Moscow advised the War Department that the war would be over in 3 months. I well remember that the German estimate for the length of World War I was also 3 months.

These estimates should place us on guard against those who believe that long, worldwide wars are no longer possible. Even the present "minor" Vietnamese wars has endured for longer than the foremost defense civilians and our military leaders predicted.

Having served in both World Wars, I may perhaps be forgiven for not being as optimistic about permanent peace, the beneficence of unilateral disarmament, and the current belief held by many—especially by our "intellectuals"—that the sheer horror of a long war will compel its avoidance.

A brief look at some of the grim statistics of World War II will show why prevention of war is an order of magnitude less costly than engaging in it. The money we save today in lowering our defenses will surely be but a pittance compared with what it will cost us if we are not strong enough to deter war.

Russia was invaded in June 1941. By winter of that year the cost of the war was already truly colossal. To the 6 million, possibly as many as 8 million, military losses in killed and captured were added millions of civilian casualties—a million or more dead of starva-

tion alone in Leningrad during the winter of 1941-1942.

By the end of 1941 the Soviet Union had lost 47 per cent of her inhabited places, territory in which 80 million persons had lived. That territory had produced 71 per cent of Soviet pig iron, 58 per cent of its steel, 63 per cent of its coal, and 42 per cent of its electricity. By the end of their 1941 offensive the Germans had occupied areas that had produced 38 per cent of the grain and cattle and 84 per cent of the Soviet sugar.

The total military service deaths on the Soviet side reached more than 12 million. The West German estimate of Soviet military losses is 13.6 million, including 1.75 million permanently disabled. The war also cost the Soviets some 7 million civilians. The losses, civilian and military, of Finland, the Baltic States, and of eastern and southeastern European countries added millions more.

The German military dead in World War II numbered between 3 and 3.5 million; their civilian dead, 1.5 million.

The figures I have stated are vastly increased by the military and civilian dead of Great Britain, France, the United States, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Japan, China, and of many more countries. Poland lost one quarter of her entire people. The total of all soldiers killed in World War II was 26.8 million.

Unfortunately, few people study history, which accounts for the truism that history repeats itself. In fact, not many of our people understand the devastation wrought by World War II. That war ended a quarter of a century ago. Half the people in the United States were not alive then; they, as well as people then in their early teens, had no direct connection with the war.

It is not too farfetched to say that 75 per cent of the American people have no vivid memory of what a world war really means. The lesson of that war, its page of history, is worth a book of logic.

You may remember Blackstone's statement that security of the person is the first, and liberty of the individual the second "absolute right inherent in every Englishman." Just so, the first right of every American is to be protected against foreign attack, and the first duty of our Government is to keep our Nation alive. Given the world situation, this calls for maintenance of a defense capability adequate to discourage potential aggressors. President Nixon has said:

"It is essential to avoid putting an American President, either this President or the next President, in the position where the United States would be second rather than first or at least equal to any potential enemy."

He has also said, in discussing the Cuban missile crisis:

"I do not want to see an American President in the future, in the event of any crisis, have his diplomatic credibility impaired because the United States was in a second-class or inferior position. We saw what it meant to the Soviets when they were second."

Turning back to the present, you may ask what needs to be done in these times of turmoil and peril. The blunt situation facing us is that Soviet Russia is doing all the things a nation would do if it wanted to be the No. One military power with clear unequivocal superiority.

The U.S. Navy has not taken any further steps to increase its strategic offensive force. There has not been an arms race—the Soviets have been running at full speed all by themselves.

However, as I am most familiar with the threat posed by the Soviets to our naval power, I would like to confine myself to this area, and specifically to submarines. But the logic of what I say is valid for land, sea, and air power as well.

The Soviets are embarked on a program which reveals a singular awareness of the

importance of sea power, and an unmistakable resolve to become the most powerful maritime force in the world. They demonstrate a thorough understanding of the basic elements of sea power: knowledge of the seas; a strong, modern merchant marine; and a powerful new navy. They are surging forward with a naval and maritime program that is a technological marvel.

Starting with 200 diesel-powered submarines at the end of World War II, most of which were obsolete, the Soviet Union embarked on the largest peacetime submarine construction program in history, producing over 580 modern submarines in 26 years—most designed for long-range operations.

During the same period the United States built 113 submarines. In two years alone, 1955 and 1956, the Soviets completed 150 submarines, almost 1½ times the total number of submarines this country has produced in the past 26 years.

The Soviets have applied tremendous national resources to the expansion and modernization of their submarine construction yards. They now have the largest and most modern submarine building yards in the world, giving them several times the nuclear submarine construction capacity possessed by the United States.

They are credited with a nuclear submarine production capability of twenty ships a year on a single-shift basis. They have the facilities to increase this rate of production considerably. At present, while our Posedon conversions are going on, the maximum U.S. capacity to build nuclear submarines is less than half that of the Soviets. Upon completion of these conversions—about 1977—the best we could do would still be well below their capacity.

One of the most important steps they have taken has been the development of a larger reservoir of trained engineers to support their submarine design and building program. They graduate ten times as many naval architects and marine engineers per year as we.

While we cannot specifically count the number of Soviet scientists, and engineers devoted to naval work, it is apparent that they have created a broad technological base. They have committed extensive resources to support development of their naval forces.

According to the latest unclassified data, the Soviets now have a total of about 340 submarines, all built since World War II. About 100 of these are nuclear-powered. The total U.S. force is 137 submarines, 95 of which are nuclear-powered, the remainder diesel-powered. Most of our diesel units were built during World War II.

Today, as a result of the Soviet large-scale construction program, our lead in nuclear-powered submarines has disappeared. They are yearly out-producing us in nuclear submarines by 3 or 4 to 1. Even if we should decide at once to reverse this trend, our efforts could not begin to bear fruit for several years. In the interim, the Russian lead will grow substantially. By 1975 it is estimated they will have something like 50 per cent more nuclear submarines than the United States.

Of even greater concern than total numbers is the fact that since 1968 the Soviets have introduced several new designs, besides converting older designs to improve their capabilities. They have introduced significantly improved second-generation versions of the first-generation attack, cruise-missile, and ballistic-missile nuclear submarine designs.

One of their current new designs is the YANKEE class nuclear-powered ballistic-missile submarine introduced in 1968. These submarines look very much like our latest Polaris type and are capable of submerged launching of 16 ballistic missiles with a range of 1,300 miles.

They now have some thirty-five of the YANKEE class in operation or under construction; this class is being built at a rate of about six to eight a year. It is estimated that they will surpass our Polaris fleet of forty-one by 1974, probably sooner.

Further, it must not be forgotten that the Soviets also have over thirty conventional and nuclear-powered ballistic-missile submarines of an earlier design. Thus, we are faced with the imminent loss of our lead in numbers of sea-based strategic missiles—no matter what action we take today.

While the extent of their submarine design and construction effort is alarming, this is not the only area of concern. We have long relied on superior quality in our submarines to compensate for lack of numbers. But recent evidence indicates that the Soviets are making considerable progress in all aspects of submarine capability, thus markedly reducing whatever qualitative advantage we may have had. Weapon systems, speed, detection devices, quietness of operation, all make a significant contribution to the effectiveness of a submarine force. From what we have been able to learn, they have attained equality in a number of these characteristics and superiority in some.

The Soviet submarine force, like the entire Soviet Navy, has become capable of sustained open-ocean operations and is being used to support foreign policy in various areas of the world. Last year the tempo of worldwide Soviet submarine operations was at an all-time high.

During their 1970 large-scale naval maneuvers that included over 200 ships in the Atlantic and Pacific oceans and in 9 adjoining seas, they deployed a large number of nuclear submarines away from their home bases.

Because of their expanding range of operations, the Soviet Navy can now deploy long-range missiles in submarines hidden underwater along the entire length of our Atlantic and Pacific coasts and in the Gulf of Mexico. Thus they have brought 95 per cent of American population and industrial centers within the range of their submarine-based missiles.

We now must reconcile ourselves to living with Russian submarines targeting their nuclear missiles on us from nearby ocean areas we thought of until recently as friendly American waters.

The Russians are in the Mediterranean. They operate regularly and continually in the North Atlantic and the Norwegian Sea. Russian naval units now are being seen with regularity in the Indian Ocean and off both coasts of Africa. They are in the Pacific, the Arctic, and the Antarctic.

The swimming Russian bear is not yet 10 feet tall, but he is 5 feet, 8 inches—and growing rapidly. He has not yet wrested supremacy of the seas from the free world, but he is making a very determined effort to do so. If we are not alert, we may find tomorrow that our strength has been check-mated at sea.

Throughout our history the waters that wash our shores have been friendly. They have given us geographical protection, making it practically impossible for anyone to attack us. They also have given us time to build up our strength when danger threatened.

But the tempo of modern technology has changed all this, as it has changed so many other things. It has stripped this country of our "friendly oceans." The Atlantic and the Pacific are no longer "friendly"—they have become broad highways whence attacks can be launched against us.

The fact that our country, previously invulnerable, has now become vulnerable must sink into the public consciousness.

Today it is fashionable to advocate a reduction in defense and to use the money saved for domestic purposes. Those who so advocate do not test their theories or their

deductions by events. While men are perishing from the eruption of a volcano they are blissfully beating time and listening to the music of the heavenly spheres and marveling at the harmony. Meanwhile Soviet Russia is preparing a military establishment which, by 1975, can be ahead of ours in virtually all respects.

The bearer of bad news is always punished. In ancient times, he might be put to death. Today he becomes "controversial" and unpopular. But if there is one subject on which the American people must know the truth, however unpalatable, it is our military position vis-à-vis the Soviets.

"Peace for our time!" declared Neville Chamberlain. And what followed was 6 years of one of the bloodiest conflicts ever experienced by mankind—a conflict that nearly wrecked Western civilization. Let us hope that the lessons of appeasement and unpreparedness have not receded into the dim shadows of past victory.

### SOME THINGS YOU ALWAYS WANTED TO KNOW ABOUT THE TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE BUT HAVE BEEN AFRAID TO ASK

#### HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I regret that certain ill-advised comments have been made about the draft permit stipulations for the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline. Our colleague, Congressman LES ASPIN of Wisconsin, the author of these comments, did not bother to contact the Department of the Interior or otherwise learn all of the facts which were available at the time. Instead, he based his statement on information brought to him in a paper bag.

The comments were made on December 31, 1971; and they compare the January 1971 draft with a September 30, 1971, draft. However, there is a later draft dated December 15, 1971, which has some significant changes from the September draft.

The Department of the Interior has appointed a stipulations review team to be primarily responsible for drafting the permit stipulations. This committee has been closely involved with the perfection of these stipulations for over 2 years, and it would be irresponsible to comment on the work of this committee without first finding out what the committee is considering.

In an effort to clear the air of unfounded allegations and to keep the Congress and the public informed of the real efforts of the Department of the Interior on behalf of the environment, I am submitting for the RECORD a memorandum dated January 7, 1971, by the stipulations review team. This memorandum reviews certain suggested revisions of the proposed stipulations and concludes by saying:

The Review Team has not yet completed its review and the stipulations are still in draft form. If the review discloses any weaknesses, they will be remedied before the proposed stipulations are presented to the Secretary for his consideration.

Anyone desiring to make comments about the proposed stipulations in the

future should visit the Department of the Interior to inquire about the continuing progress on the stipulations, as opposed to utilizing the more cumbersome technique of press release based on paper bag intelligence.

The memorandum follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,  
Washington, D.C., January 7, 1972.

To: Deputy Under Secretary.  
From: Stipulations Review Team.  
Subject: Proposed Trans-Alaska Pipeline—  
Draft Permit Stipulations.

This responds to your request that a review be made of certain suggested revisions of the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline stipulations. As you know, the stipulations are being prepared for inclusion in any pipeline right-of-way permit that may be issued by the Department. Since the initial draft of such stipulations was prepared, over two years ago, a number of revised drafts have been prepared by the Stipulations Review Team. The revisions made by the team are actually recommendations made by the team in an effort to perfect the stipulations. Those recommendations will eventually be presented to the Secretary for his approval or rejection. That stage has not as yet been reached and the proposed stipulations are still in draft form; the date of the latest draft being December 15, 1971.

The suggested revisions which you requested be reviewed are those that are set forth in an interim working draft dated September 30, 1971. You requested that the review be made to determine whether, when compared to the draft of January 1971 which was an attachment to the Draft Environmental Statement, the suggested revisions had the effect of weakening the stipulations. This memorandum answers that question for each of the proposed revisions you enumerated and, in addition, relates them to the current draft of the stipulations. This memorandum was prepared after consultation with the other members of the Stipulations Review Team and technical consultants who participated in the Team's review, and it has their concurrence.

1. The first proposed revision concerns the provision which appeared at B.5.a. of the draft of January 1971 as follows (at page 11): "Any structure, property, land, or aquatic habitat (including the renewable fish resources contained therein) harmed or damaged by or during the construction, operation or maintenance of the Pipeline shall be reconstructed, repaired, rehabilitated and restored, as may be necessary, by Permittee as soon as practicable, so that the condition thereof, in the judgment of the Authorized Officer, is at least equal to the condition thereof immediately prior to such damage or destruction. Permittee further shall abate as soon as practicable any condition existing with respect to the Pipeline or with respect to the construction, operation or maintenance thereof, which may be causing harm or damage to any person, structure, property, land, stream, wildlife or fishery resources."

After review, the provision was changed to read as follows at B.5.a. of the working draft revision dated September 30, 1971, at page 9):

"Permittee shall abate as soon as practicable any condition existing with respect to the construction, operation, or maintenance of the Pipeline which may be causing harm or damage to any person, structure, property, land or aquatic habitat, or fishery and wildlife resource. Any structure, property, land or aquatic habitat, or fishery and wildlife resource harmed or damaged by or during the construction, operation, or maintenance of the Pipeline shall be reconstructed, repaired, rehabilitated, and restored to the satisfaction of the Authorized Officer by the Permittee."

In the current draft, of December 15, 1971, it appears as follows at 1.7.1.1. (page 14):

"Permittee shall abate as soon as practicable any condition existing with respect to

the construction, operation or maintenance of the Pipeline that causes or threatens to cause harm or damage to any person, structure, property, land, aquatic habitat or other resource. Any structure, property, land, fish and wildlife and their habitat or any other resources harmed or damaged by or during the construction, operation, maintenance or abandonment of the pipeline shall be reconstructed, repaired, rehabilitated and restored to the satisfaction of the Authorized Officer by Permittee. Permittee shall be liable in accordance with applicable laws for loss or damage to property of others or for bodily injuries to or the death of any person in any way arising from or connected with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the pipeline."

There were several reasons for suggesting the revision. As originally written, the Permittee would be required to reconstruct, repair rehabilitate and restore damaged structures or lands to a state which in the opinion of the Authorized Officer was "at least equal to" the condition which had obtained prior to the damage. This raised the question as to what "equal" meant. It was not clear what standard was to be employed. One possible interpretation would be that it related to physical characteristics; another, that it related to the quality or integrity of the damaged structure or land. With such differing interpretations, it could be possible, in a dispute regarding compliance, for the Permittee to claim that it had met the requirement by performing minimal repairs, even though the Authorized Officer might not agree and might wish more to be done. Rather than allowing such a disagreement to arise, it was thought better to remove the ambiguity.

In addition, it was recognized that in some situations, it might be better from an environmental standpoint, to repair or reconstruct differently than the January 1971 stipulation required. For example, the removal of a building might be beneficial, and restoration or repair not desired at all; if a ledge were cut down, it might be better from an environmental or engineering standpoint to replace it with a more gentle slope. Because of the many possibilities, it was felt that this was a matter best left to the judgment of the Authorized Officer, unfettered with an arbitrary standard which might pose practical difficulties.

It should also be noted that the stipulation has been strengthened to require the Permittee to abate conditions which threaten, harm or damage.

2. The second proposed revision concerns the provision which appeared as E.2, at page 29 of the January 1971 draft, as follows:

"Permittee shall conduct its activities in a manner which will prevent pollution of land and water, and will not degrade the present high quality of Alaskan waters, thereby protecting aquatic and terrestrial life."

"Toxic material, sediments, or organic substances which cause eutrophication shall not be released in any lake, water drainage, estuary, or marine waters in such concentrations as would exceed acceptable water standards. Every effort shall be made to protect water bodies from damage by erosion and unnatural drainage conditions. In the design, construction and operation of the Pipeline, protection or water quality shall be of prime importance. Criteria for compliance shall be the "Alaska State Plan-Water Quality Standards for Interstate Waters within the State of Alaska" as revised.

"Unless waived by the Authorized Officer, dikes or cofferdams shall be installed to separate concrete work areas from lakes or streams during construction."

"Mobile ground equipment shall be kept out of the waters of lakes, streams or rivers except for necessary crossings within right-of-way limits."

It appeared in the September 30, 1971, draft as E.2, at page 23, as follows:

"Permittee shall conduct its activities in a manner that will prevent pollution of land

and water and will not degrade the present quality of Alaskan waters thereby protecting aquatic and terrestrial life.

"Any material, sediments, or organic substances that cause toxicity or eutrophication shall not be released to any surface or subsurface waters in concentrations that violate the State of Alaska "Water Quality Standards" as approved by the Environmental Protection Agency.

"Mobile ground equipment shall not be operated in lakes, streams or rivers except as essential for authorized operations."

The current language is at 2.2.2 of the December 15, 1971, (page 26) as follows:

**"2.2.2 Water and Land Pollution.**

"2.2.2.1 Permittee shall comply with applicable "Water Quality Standards" of the State of Alaska as approved by the Environmental Protection Agency.

"2.2.2.2 Unless approved by the Authorized Officer, mobile ground equipment shall not be operated in lakes, streams or rivers.

At the time the January 1971 draft was prepared, the Water Quality Standards of the State of Alaska had not been fully approved by the Environmental Protection Agency. Accordingly, it was determined to utilize some general language and reconsider the language after the Standards were completed. Such has now occurred and the approved Standards obviate the need for the prior language. In addition, the second sentence, dealing with erosion, now appears at 2.4 of the December 15, 1971, draft. The changes have made the stipulation more specific and therefore more enforceable and nothing of substance has been deleted.

3. The third proposed revision concerns the authority of the Authorized Officer and appeared in B.2 of the January 1971 draft (at page 4) as follows:

"In the event the Authorized Officer determines in his absolute discretion that Permittee has failed or refused to comply with any provisions of this permit, or any other permit issued in connection with the Pipeline, the Authorized Officer, by written order, may suspend or terminate any or all of Permittee's activities under any or all of such permits. Permittee shall not resume such suspended or terminated activities until given written authorization to do so by the Authorized Officer."

It appeared in B.2 of the September 30, 1971, draft at page 3, as follows:

"In the event the Authorized Officer determines that Permittee has failed or refused to comply with any provision of this permit or any other permit issued in connection with the Pipeline, the Authorized Officer, by written order, may suspend or terminate any or all of Permittee's activities under any or all of such permits. Permittee shall not resume such suspended or terminated activities until given written authorization to do so by the Authorized Officer."

It now appears in the December 15, 1971, draft as 1.3.4 (page 5) as follows:

"In the event the Authorized Officer determines that Permittee has failed or refused to comply with any provision of this permit or any other permit issued in connection with the Pipeline, the Authorized Officer, by written order, may suspend or terminate any or all of Permittee's activities under any or all of such permits. Permittee shall not resume such suspended or terminated activities until given written authorization to do so by the Authorized Officer."

The change in question is the deletion of the words "in his absolute discretion." The Review Team removed this for several reasons. First, the determination regarding Permittee's compliance or non-compliance is, by the terms of the stipulation as a whole, discretionary in the Authorized Officer and that discretion is not decreased at all by the deletion of the "absolute" language. In the event that a dispute arose over a determination of the Authorized Officer and litigation

ensued, the court would never uphold an exercise of administrative discretion that was not reasonable in the circumstances of the case. Neither equity nor administrative law would recognize an administrator's "absolute" discretion. Although colorful, the word was of no practical or legal significance. Secondly, use of the term made the stipulation contradictory on its face, since the next paragraph provided for appeals to the Secretary of the Interior. It was therefore patent that the Authorized Officer's discretionary determination was not "absolute." Thirdly, use of the term raised questions regarding the extent and nature of the Authorized Officer's discretionary authority under the other stipulations.

4. The fourth proposed revision concerns the liabilities of the Permittee with respect to Alaska fish resources. Subsection B.5.a. of the January 1971 draft, (page 11) required the permittee to reconstruct, repair, rehabilitate or restore any structures, property, land or aquatic habitat (including the renewable fish resources contained therein) harmed or damaged during construction, operation or maintenance of the pipeline. It further required the permittee to abate as soon as practicable any condition existing with respect to the pipeline or with respect to the construction, operation or maintenance thereof, which may be causing harm or damage to any person, structure, property, land, stream, wildlife or fishery resource.

The text of subsection B.5.a. of the January 1971 draft is as follows:

**"5. LIABILITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERMITTEE**

"a. Any structure, property, land or aquatic habitat (including the renewable fish resources contained therein) harmed or damaged by or during the construction, operation or maintenance of the Pipeline shall be reconstructed, repaired, rehabilitated and restored, as may be necessary, by Permittee as soon as practicable, so that the condition thereof, in the judgment of the Authorized Officer, is at least equal to the condition thereof immediately prior to such damage or destruction. Permittee further shall abate as soon as practicable any condition existing with respect to the Pipeline or with respect to the construction, operation or maintenance thereof, which may be causing harm or damage to any person, structure, property, land, stream, wildlife or fishery resource."

In the draft of September 30, 1971, the first sentence of subsection B.5.a. required the permittee to abate, as soon as practicable, any condition causing harm or damage to any aquatic habitat or fishery or wildlife resource. The second sentence required the permittee to repair, reconstruct, rehabilitate and restore any structure, property, land or aquatic habitat, or fishery and wildlife resource harmed or damaged by or during the construction, operation or maintenance of the pipeline.

The text of subsection B.5.a. which appeared at page 9 of the September 30, 1971, draft, is as follows:

**"5. LIABILITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF PERMITTEE**

"a. Permittee shall abate as soon as practicable any condition existing with respect to the construction, operation or maintenance of the Pipeline which may be causing harm or damage to any person, structure, property, land or aquatic habitat, or fishery and wildlife resource. Any structure, property, land or aquatic habitat or fishery or wildlife resource harmed or damaged by or during the construction, operation, or maintenance of the Pipeline shall be reconstructed, repaired, rehabilitated, and restored to the satisfaction of the Authorized Officer by the Permittee

It can be seen that there is little, if any, difference between the two drafts thus far.

However, a new provision was added in the September 30, 1971, draft at subsection B.5.b. (page 9) which provided that the Permittee would be liable, under State law, for loss or damage to property of others in any way arising from or connected with the construction, operation, or maintenance of the pipeline. Property interests of the Alaskan fishing industry would be encompassed by this provision. The text of the subsection is as follows:

"b. Permittee shall be liable in accordance with the law of the State of Alaska for loss or damage to property of others or for bodily injuries to or the death of any person in any way arising from or connected with the construction, operation or maintenance of the Pipeline.

It is apparent from the foregoing that there is little difference between the corresponding language of the two drafts. It can hardly be said that the later draft affords less protection to the Alaskan fishing industry than the earlier one.

In addition, some comment must be made regarding the latest draft, that of December 15, 1971. The liabilities provisions of that draft are found at section 1.7 (pages 14-16). They are similar to those of the September 30, 1971 draft, with slight changes which do not alter their substance. One strengthening change of importance that was made is that the Permittee is required to abate any condition existing with regard to the construction, operation or maintenance of the pipeline that causes or threatens to cause harm or damage to any person, structure, property, land, aquatic or other resource. A second change is that the restoration provision now extends to harm or damage caused by construction, operation, maintenance or abandonment of the pipeline. In addition, the bonding requirement (section 1.8) has been revised to call for a larger bond.

5. The fifth proposed revision deals with the sections of the stipulations pertaining to culverts and bridges. The January 1971 draft contained the following provision (section 4b of the Technical Stipulations, p. 9):

**"b. For culverts and bridges:**

"(1) Design for all culverts and bridges on pads and roads necessary for maintenance of the Pipeline shall be in accordance with criteria established by the American Association of State Highway Officials and the Bureau of Public Roads and endorsed by State of Alaska, Department of Highways, to accommodate a 50-year flood or the greatest flood of record, whichever is greater."

The section was changed in the September 30, 1971, draft (sec. R.4.a.iii, p. 46) to read as follows:

**"iii. For culverts and bridges:**

"Design for all culverts and bridges on pads and roads necessary for maintenance of the Pipeline shall be in accordance with criteria established by the American Association of State Highway Officials and the Federal Highway Administration and endorsed by the State of Alaska, Department of Highways, to accommodate a 50-year flood."

In the December 15, 1971, draft, it appears as follows at section 3.6.1.2.1. (pp. 52, 53):

"3.6.1.2.1. Culverts and bridges necessary for maintenance of the Pipeline, shall be designed to accommodate a 50-year flood in accordance with criteria established by the American Association of State Highway Officials and the Federal Highway Administration and endorsed by the State of Alaska, Department of Highways."

The significant proposed change is the deletion of the reference to "the greatest flood of record." "The greatest flood of record" is a technical term referring to a measured value, dependent upon actual flood records. It does not provide a valid basis for design in areas where flood records either do not exist or exist only for short-term periods. That is the situation in Alaska and therefore the suggested

revision was made to conform with design criteria that are valid in that situation.

6. The sixth proposed revision concerns the section dealing with erosion. In the January 1971 draft, that section of the Technical Stipulation (4. c., at page 10) provided as follows:

*"c. Erosion*

"Erosion control methods shall be designed on the basis of and to accommodate, the runoff produced by the maximum rainfall rate and snow melt rate combination reasonably characteristic of the region. The design shall also accommodate effects that result from thawing produced by flowing or ponded water on permafrost terrain.

In the September 1971 draft, it appears as follows (at R.4.b. page 47):

*"b. Erosion*

"Erosion control procedures shall accommodate and be based on the runoff produced by the maximum rainfall rate and snow melt rate combination reasonably characteristic of the region. The procedures shall also accommodate effects that result from thawing produced by flowing or ponded water on permafrost terrain."

Comparison of the two sections reveals that the later one is not weaker; on the contrary, it is stronger. The current version appears at section 3.6.2 of the December 15, 1971, draft as follows:

*"3.6.2 Erosion.*

"3.6.2.1 Where necessary because of outfall erosion, stilling basins shall be constructed at the outflow end of culverts. To prevent erosion the pool sides shall be stabilized with riprap or other appropriate methods.

"3.6.2.2 Slopes of cuts through stream banks shall be designed and constructed to minimize erosion and prevent slides.

"3.6.2.3 Erosion control procedures shall accommodate and be based on the runoff produced by the maximum rainfall rate and snow melt rate combination reasonably characteristic of the region. The procedures shall also accommodate effects that result from thawing produced by flowing or ponded water on permafrost terrain."

In conclusion, the changes in question were made to strengthen and clarify the stipulations and make them fully enforceable. This was done in accordance with the continuing instructions of the Secretary. The Review Team has not yet completed its review and the stipulations are still in draft form. If the review discloses any weaknesses, they will be remedied before the proposed stipulations are presented to the Secretary for his consideration.

JOHN J. McHALE,  
Assistant Solicitor Member,  
Stipulation Review Team.

**A PLEA FOR THE COMMUTATION OF  
SENTENCE OF JANICE MARIE  
GREEN, A 14-YEAR-OLD CHILD**

**HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I request that the material concerning the case of Janice Marie Green be submitted for entry in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have sent a copy of the enclosed in a Dear Colleague letter to all the Members of Congress. However, because of the tremendous amount of interest this letter has created, I would like for all not just Senators and Congressmen to have the opportunity to read the enclosed

which relates to the problem of forced busing of our school children.

The material follows:

**A PLEA FOR THE COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE  
OF JANICE MARIE GREEN, A 14-YEAR-OLD  
CHILD**

It is Christmas. . . . A time of Love. . . . A time of Charity. . . . A time when even those who have committed crimes against the state and against the people are looked upon with brotherly love and released from their sentence.

I ask for the release from sentence of Janice Marie Green, an innocent fourteen year-old girl, who has committed no crime, other than that of being born white.

Janice Marie Green is being forced to ride a school bus twenty miles a day in an act perpetrated by the Muscogee County School Board and its Superintendent of Schools of Columbus, Georgia, that is nothing other than arbitrary, discriminatory, and capricious.

Janice Marie Green is not a racist.

Janice Marie Green does not object to integration, but she and her family do object to her being bused twenty miles a day when she is almost within walking distance of an integrated school right near her home (a school which she attended last year and had been accepted in for this year), and when she is forced to ride the bus past six other integrated schools to arrive at the one "selected" for her by an arrogant, uncouth Superintendent of Schools who cloaks himself with the wealth and power of the appointed school board, composed of 15 appointed, elite members, most of whom either have no children in school, or have their children in a private school.

Why do I use such terms as arrogant and uncouth?

The Superintendent (who lives in an exclusive white neighborhood) has told parents that his burden would be easier if: (1) people would be kind enough to live in neighborhoods in a ratio proportionate to the black/white ratio of school children; and (2) mothers would push the pill and stop overcrowding the schools. What adjectives would you use to describe such a man?

Janice Marie Green should be completing her eighth grade studies at Rothschild Junior High School this school year. Her father asked the local school board to reconsider the assignment of his child and to be heard by the local school board as provided by law. In a mockery of justice, the school board, giggling, snickering and rushing towards other appointments, refused to grant Janice Marie Green her rights to attend the school nearest her home which had not yet filled its "quota" of white students, according to a plan adopted by the school board. Rothschild has not yet filled its white quota. It is the nearest school to Janice Marie Green's home. But the superintendent and the school board refused to let her complete her eighth grade studies there.

Following the rights guaranteed to him and to his child by the Constitution, Janice Marie Green's father appealed his case to the State Board of Education. He was officially notified that his case would be heard on December 16, 1971. Dropping all other matters, he came to Atlanta to tell his story. But before he had an opportunity to speak, the State Board—in an action that smacks of collusion with the local board, and which could turn out to be a conspiracy to deprive Janice Marie Green and her father of their civil and constitutional rights—literally went into a closet in "executive session" and voted not to let Mr. Green speak, claiming, and wrongly so, that they had no jurisdiction of the case.

Janice Marie Green's father is not through fighting for his child. He carries a heavy burden. He fought on foreign soil for his country. Now he asks his country to join him in fighting for the rights of his child. Several

years ago, Janice Marie Green and her two brothers were walking to school, and at an unguarded school crossing, which should have been guarded, Janice Marie Green saw her two brothers struck down by an onrushing car and hurled to their deaths. Shortly after that, Janice Marie's sister died.

Janice Marie Green's father has many avenues to travel in seeking to correct the arbitrary assignment of his child. All of them are costly.

He can enter court and attempt to force the State Board to hear his case and to render a decision.

He can bring his action into federal court to attempt to force the local school board to assign his child properly.

He can put his child in private school.

Janice Marie's father can afford none of these.

And so I come to you at Christmastime and ask for your help. The power to act is the greatest power you possess. Certainly if you can commute the death sentence of a criminal at Christmastime, you surely can commute the sentence of this innocent victim by having her placed in Rothschild, the school she should be attending. This executive action is warranted by the hardship endured by this child and her family.

It has been said that Freedom is neither free nor necessarily forever. It can be lost just as permanently by apathy as it can by the forces of war.

Janice Marie Green's father is fighting for her freedom. You have the power to help him. You can help fight for this American girl's rights—and ultimately your own—or you can let them fall by the wayside.

Will you help?

LEE MILLER,  
(A friend of Janice Marie Green.)

**PRESIDENT SHOULD BE COMMENDED  
FOR HIS GREAT ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

**HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I have here two columns, one from the Cincinnati Enquirer and one from the Indianapolis Star. Both were written by Jeffrey Hart, ideological conservative. Mr. Hart maintains that the performance of the Nixon administration has been highly productive and in the best interest of the American people. Equally significant, he comments on the importance of withholding judgment until a program or action has progressed to the point where it is worthy of judgment.

The Nixon administration has made a great contribution to this country and the entire free world. It is my contention that the President should be commended for his great accomplishments.

I enter the two columns for your consideration:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Dec. 16, 1971]

**POINTS OF REBELLING CONSERVATIVES**

(By JEFFREY HART)

In a recent column I reported on the case a great many conservatives are making against a second term for President Nixon. According to those arguments, it now seems likely a conservative Republican will run against Mr. Nixon in New Hampshire. But what answer can be made to the points the rebelling conservatives are putting forward?

1. It is by no means certain, to say the

least, that the Supreme Court nominees of Humphrey, Muskie or Kennedy would be about as acceptable as Mr. Nixon's. After all, from LBJ we got Thurgood Marshall—a knee-jerk liberal—and we almost got Abe Fortas as chief justice. The Supreme Court is a vital battleground, and there Mr. Nixon has been resolute.

2. On civil disruption Mr. Nixon and his Justice Department have been excellent. Mitchell and Kleindienst took a firm stand on the May Day disruptions, and the underground has been relentlessly harassed. Ask the Berrigans. With great ingenuity, Federal prosecutors have been using the grand jury system to keep maximum heat on the would-be revolutionaries. Conservatives can take great comfort from a glance at the liberal journals like the *New Republic* and from radical ones like the *New York Review of Books* or *Ramparts*. The screams there are deafening. The left is under no illusions about the administration's intentions.

3. At the beginning of a Tale of a Tub, Jonathan Swift tells about the barrel sailors used to throw overboard to distract a hostile whale. In my opinion, both Mr. Nixon's economic controls and his Family Assistance Plan are barrels. At the time he instituted the economic controls, Mr. Nixon was under intense pressure from the Democrats on the economic issue. His earlier "game plan" was making headway against inflation, but not nearly enough to be politically visible. Senator George McGovern had dropped the war as an issue and was hammering away at the economic issue. Mr. Nixon himself told me that the Republicans are peculiarly vulnerable on the economic issue. Memories of the depression linger. Therefore his new economic ploy, which has completely defused the issue. The beauty of the ploy is that so little of the economy has really come under control, and that, doubtless, on a temporary basis.

What about FAP, which justifiably outrages conservatives? Another barrel, I think.

During the 1968 campaign, Mr. Nixon tossed out a barrel in the form of a proposal for a "new coalition." It supposedly would consist of all who desired freedom from government interference—states rights, black-power types, free-market businessmen, do-your-thing youth. No sophisticate, least of all Mr. Nixon, took the idea seriously at all. It was purely diversionary, something for the pundits to write about.

FAP is surely another such "fascinating idea," and it helps keep some otherwise anti-administration political groupings at least partly demobilized. Nevertheless FAP is a barrel. Rhetoric aside, the administration's political backing for FAP has been zero, and it was one of the first things sacrificed in the new economic policy.

4. Which leaves foreign policy, particularly Peking and Taipei, and national defense. But that discussion requires a separate column.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Dec. 24, 1971]

ASHBROOK VERSUS NIXON

(By Jeffrey Hart)

With the surfacing of a prospective New Hampshire primary campaign by Rep. John Ashbrook, the conservative rebellion against the policies of the Nixon administration begins to take on political substance. Ashbrook might do well in New Hampshire. He would be strongly backed by the Manchester Union Leader, which is generally agreed to be influential with some 20% of the voters—though, to be sure, about half of that 20% probably vote in the Democratic rather than in the Republican primary. In addition, the rebellious Conservative Party in New York State clearly has the ability to hurt Mr. Nixon.

This is a good time, therefore, to examine the two most serious conservative grievances: national defense and Taiwan.

On the vital matter of national defense I

think that a final adverse judgment is still premature.

It is true that the Soviet Union has closed, or is about to close, the nuclear gap, and that current trends projected into the future would give the Soviets clear superiority by 1976.

At present, however, the Nixon administration is testing the assumption that the Soviets, having achieved parity or something like it, might be willing to settle for detente and a realistic arms limitation. Is it true that such a resolution is now perceived by both sides as being in their national interest?

Naturally there must be a time limit on this testing period. And here the signals given by the administration are encouraging. Despite liberal outcries, it went ahead and MIRVed Minuteman and Poseidon. It went ahead with Safeguard. And it now seems to be prepared to advance the date of the new long-range submarine missile system acronymed ULMS.

The anti-Nixon conservatives must argue, therefore, either that (a) the possibility of detente should not now be explored, or (b) that someone other than President Nixon—Senator Muskie or Senator Kennedy, say—ought to do it. I myself am not ready to support either assertion.

Where Taiwan is concerned the intentions of the administration are not yet clear. Was the adverse UN vote an administration blunder or, rather, a result which the administration desired and brought about in a Machiavellian way? Unlike William Rusher, publisher of *National Review*, I tend to favor Machiavelli. The presence of Henry Kissinger in Peking at the time of the UN vote was simply too obvious an indication of priorities to have been accidental. As far as the UN is concerned, Mr. Nixon sprang the trapdoor under Chiang Kai-shek.

But what does this mean? Not necessarily that we are abandoning Taiwan. What matters is what we do—not what the UN does.

The UN operation, therefore, should be viewed merely as a clearing of the boards prior to the talks in Peking. In the long run, the future of Taiwan will depend upon the kind of settlement, if any, that it is possible to work out in the Pacific, and many scenarios are now possible, not necessarily to the disadvantage of Taiwan. In any event, given shifting political equations, no U.S. President can be expected to pursue a Taiwan-first foreign policy.

On both of these serious and controversial issues, therefore, it seems to me that conservatives should assess policies by their results. And on both the results are not yet in.

LAWRENCE J. BLYTHE

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lawrence J. Blythe, a distinguished Kansan with an impressive record of achievement in many areas, recently was taken by death. It was my privilege to serve with Mr. Blythe during my years in the Kansas House of Representatives, and to continue working with him when I served in the State senate.

His interests and his accomplishments were many. He did much to assist the farm economy of Kansas. He was a leader in the campaign for better highways and construction of the Kansas Turnpike. He was in the forefront of the effort to expand rural electrification. Lawrence

Blythe will be missed by all of us in Kansas.

Mrs. Shriver and I join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Blythe and to the citizens of his hometown of White City upon their great loss.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the *Hutchinson, Kans., News* which appropriately eulogizes Mr. Blythe:

LAWRENCE J. BLYTHE

Legislative old-timers recall Lawrence J. Blythe of White City with a bit of awe, coupled with a sigh that we don't seem to produce them like that any more.

Mr. Blythe died the other day, at the age of 82, but he left behind a public record that will live for years.

He received his prominence as boss of the House agriculture committee, and then as head of roads and highways. He headed the group that expanded rural electrification in Kansas. He then settled into running the Kansas Turnpike Authority with a rare combination of foresightedness and practicality.

One regrets he isn't around to tackle the Governor today on the subject of economy, a matter dear to Mr. Blythe's heart before it became a partisan football.

A big man, gruff in talk, with amazing vigor, he always let you know where he stood. And why. At the same time, he had an uncanny knack for dealing with both the legislators and the public.

He was a rare one.

SHE BELIEVES IN WOMEN

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, New Haven, Conn., has been fortunate in having Ella Scantlebury as its treasurer for the past 11 years. One of the first black city officials and one of the first black women officeholders in the Nation, Mrs. Scantlebury has now retired from that position, although she continues to maintain an active work, civic, social, and family life.

This Friday many of Ella's friends will honor her at a testimonial dinner. I know her friends and associates will feel, as I do, great respect and admiration for a woman who gave her best effort to city government, who was a pioneer in breaking-down artificial barriers to Government service, and who was and is a very warm and considerate human being.

The article follows:

SHE BELIEVES IN WOMEN

(By Marlon McDonald)

When she answers her telephone these days she says:

"Ella Scantlebury, retired"—or so she'd have you believe.

"I'm afraid they'll give me another job to do," she explained with a chuckle.

The first black elected to public office in New Haven she served as city treasurer for 11 years following her appointment in 1961 by then Mayor Richard C. Lee. She filled a vacancy caused by the death of Mrs. Mary Grinold. In each of the following five elections she campaigned and won her office handily—once polling more votes than the mayor.

Behind the bright red front door of a one-family house on Admiral Street, near the Dixwell Community Center, Mrs. Scantlebury

lives with memories of years of service to the community and the city. But she doesn't live in the past. She continues her two-day-a-week job as manager of Yale's Scroll & Key, one of the university's secret societies, a post she's held for 16 years. She guards their secrets well and refuses to tell even the number of members.

"I'm very happy there. I've met some of the finest men in life there and I'm devoted to all the boys who come in," was all she would say.

Ask her about today's woman and she has an opinion and gives it to you quickly and directly:

Although she has her doubts about a woman mayor—"unless she was very well qualified," Mrs. Scantlebury is all for women in politics.

"Women in politics is the best thing that ever happened. Women have been kept back. They received degrees and turned into housewives. What's the use of having an education if you can't use it? Especially black women today are receiving better educations and going on to careers, and into politics," she said. "I'm not downing men and I'm not a women's liberationist, but there's a quality women have that makes it possible for them to face things—they have confidence in themselves and that's good in politics."

#### MEETING THE PRESIDENT

Speaking of the high points of her career, the former treasurer recalled a trip to the White House with Lee regarding a grant for New Haven.

"I met President John F. Kennedy and his brother, Bobbie. They were so gracious. We talked about my being the first elected black city official and one of the first black women office holders in the country. I was charmed."

She also found it fascinating to visit a bonding company in New York City where certificates are prepared for cities selling bonds.

"There was one pen arranged to guide other pens so that 18 bonds could be signed at once. Officials from all over the country were signing bonds and it was interesting to meet them. There are only two places like it in the country—one in New York and the other in Chicago. We signed about \$3.5 million in bonds for the newest garage and about \$19 million for the coliseum."

She is reticent about comments on modern day politics and astutely side-steps questions on leadership in the black community, but she thinks the caliber of party workers is improving.

"People are not going to stand for the things that used to happen. I think politics are cleaner now—more young workers are college graduates—they are more aware. Years ago we didn't have the privileges of education."

"But I think life then was quieter—sweeter—things can't stay the same, however. We all get older and our lives change." She refused to run in the last election so a younger person could have the experience, she explained.

#### MORE BLACKS IN POLITICS

She's glad to see more black people in politics and accepts ethnic representation on a party ticket as a fact of life.

"The way things are now you have to have it. The blacks are tired of having all whites on the ticket. I was proud and honored to represent black people."

A native of London, England, the former city treasurer was the World War I bride of the late L. B. "Burt" Shantlebury, a sergeant in the British Army.

The couple came to the United States in 1919 and he accepted a position he was to hold for 32 years as steward of Chi Psi fraternity at Yale. His wife became a U.S. citizen in 1941 but she'd already become involved in local politics. She campaigned for Mrs. Laurabelle McCoy who was running for

alderman in 1941 and found politics "hard work but rewarding."

Because she was interested in doing something for her community she accepted the job of chairlady for the 19th Ward. Although there were few Democrats in the ward at that time, she is proud that during her 18 years in the post the ward was only lost to the Republicans twice.

It was her job to line up campaign workers for door-to-door interviews and to report to party headquarters the feelings of the voters.

"Every November we campaigned," she said. "We went out and met people. We rang every doorbell and people got to know me. People today don't know the politicians. We didn't have any trouble getting the people out to vote."

Mrs. Scantlebury is a great admirer of former Mayor Lee. She thinks he is one of the best in New Haven's history and has done more for minority people than any other chief executive in the nation. She recalls happily her association with his administration.

"I never expected to hold such a post," she recalled. "When I was a little girl in England, I never thought of such a thing. I was very proud although the post of treasurer is mostly honorary."

When she began to campaign for herself she attended meetings in every ward. She said she felt good about the nice invitations she got to speak, adding that "being black made her especially appreciative" of the nice letters. Although she'd never experienced any discrimination in her childhood, she said she was always "aware that she was black."

Her campaign tactics? "If you're going to hold office you have to get to know people. I don't believe in knocking other candidates. Don't worry what other people are doing; let the voters see what you can do and get your own plans underway."

#### CAMPAIGN PROMISES

As for campaign promises, she thinks some of them are "very bad."

"They don't seem to get anywhere and they're very seldom fulfilled," she added.

A subject the former officeholder is eloquent on is her three great-grandchildren, Lawrence, 7; Andrea, 6, and Tara Gorham, 5. A huge family of dolls on a bed and a giant mechanical man in the sitting room are proof that they visit her often. They attend nearby St. Martin School so it's easy for them to drop in, great-grandma explained.

"They are the highlights of my life," she admitted. "I just love them."

#### NEW NEIGHBORS

How does she feel about the changes she's seen in New Haven and her neighborhood?

"I wouldn't change where I live for the world. I know too many people in the neighborhood and everybody knows me; it's near a bus line so I can get downtown. In the summer I fix up my porch and enjoy sitting outside. I don't feel alone. Some of the old neighbors have moved but new ones move in. My roots are here and here's where I'll stay."

Those friends and neighbors will honor her at a testimonial on Friday at Vallee's Steak House in West Haven.

### THE UNITED STATES SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM THE UNITED NATIONS

**HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted by the

49th Assembly District of the Republican Central Committee in California, which is primarily located in the 24th Congressional District—the members of this committee stand for election every 2 years.

This resolution urges that the United States withdraw from the United Nations and that the United Nations be moved out of the United States. The United Nations has not been effective in resolving world crises, and its presence in the United States does nothing but expose our Nation to problems such as espionage and narcotics smuggling. The United Nations failed to resolve problems in the Middle East and, more recently, has demonstrated its ineptness as a mediating body in the India-Pakistan conflict.

Our Nation's citizens need to be informed about the absurdness of the United States continuing its support of the U.N. and for this reason, I am bringing this resolution to the attention of my colleagues. A similar resolution was also passed by the 25th Congressional District Republican County Central Committee.

The resolution follows:

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas the participation of the United States in the United Nations has been a doubtful venture from the conception, and

Whereas the United States has paid 40% of the expenses of the United Nations completely out of line based upon our population, and

Whereas since the United States in good faith helped in founding the United Nations for the purpose of world peace, the United States has been involved in two as yet unsettled wars in which 100,000 American soldiers gave their lives and 500,000 have been wounded, not to forget the many POW's, and

Whereas since the United Nations was founded in 1945, one billion people have been forced to live under totalitarian government, and

Whereas we believe the people of the 49th Assembly District would want the 49th District Republican County Central Committee to take a firm position in this matter,

Now therefore be it resolved: That on behalf of the American people we respectfully ask our elected leaders to get the United States out of the United Nations and the United Nations out of the United States.

### WESTINGHOUSE BUILDING WINS PITTSBURGH BOMA AWARD

**HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the pleasure of participating in the first annual David L. Lawrence Building of the Year Award ceremonies which were sponsored by the Building Owners and Management Association in Pittsburgh.

Named for that great civic servant and public official David L. Lawrence, who served as mayor of Pittsburgh and Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, the award is given to that structure in our city which most expressed, asthetically

and architecturally, the constructive sentiment of our dynamic community.

This year the winner was the new Westinghouse Electric Building, located in our city's Golden Triangle.

In announcing selection of the Westinghouse Building, the judges said that—

The Harrison and Abramowitz design was a very strong expression of the resurgence of the Pittsburgh central business district. Its dramatic impact from the westerly approaches to the city serves as a constant reminder of the growth and dynamism of Pittsburgh.

It is significant that a contest measuring architectural progress and beauty has been named for David L. Lawrence. He, more than any other individual, did more to turn Pittsburgh, the "Smoky City" of the 1940's, into the clean, gleaming expanse of skyscrapers, apartments, parks, and workplaces, that is our city today.

I introduce into the RECORD at this time an article which appeared in the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce magazine, telling of the BOMA ceremonies:

**WESTINGHOUSE BUILDING WINS DAVID L. LAWRENCE AWARD**

The Westinghouse Building, newest and last of the buildings developed by the Equitable Life Assurance Society for Gateway Center, has been unanimously selected for the David L. Lawrence Building-of-the-Year Award, sponsored by the Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) of Pittsburgh.

The 84-year-old Triangle Building and the 61-year-old Henry W. Oliver Building, both in downtown Pittsburgh's central business district, received honorable mentions in the judging.

The contest, inaugurated this year as an annual event, honors the late David L. Lawrence, former mayor of Pittsburgh and governor of Pennsylvania, who with General R. K. Mellon formed the unique alliance between business and government that produced a far-reaching program of inner-city redevelopment which became known as Pittsburgh's "Renaissance."

Gateway Center and adjoining Point State Park, once a slum area of ramshackle buildings, old warehouses and unused railroad tracks before Equitable acquired the site from the Urban Redevelopment Authority established by Mayor Lawrence in 1946, is now an attractive expanse of broad plazas, skyscrapers, fountains and gardens along the confluence of the Monongahela and Allegheny Rivers on the tip of Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle.

In announcing the awards, Ernest U. Buckman, chairman of the Building-of-the-Year Committee, called the selection of the Westinghouse Building especially fitting since it marked the completion of Gateway Center and the culmination of the project first envisioned by Mayor Lawrence back in 1946. Commemorating the selection, The Honorable W. S. Moorhead, Jr., U.S. congressman and guest speaker at the annual BOMA Light-Up Night Banquet, presented a newly designed plaque to Equitable vice president and general manager of Gateway Center, W. F. Mueller.

No specific criteria were established for judging, but comments of the judges indicated that their decision was based on esthetics, innovative construction and mechanical features, efficiency of management and character of tenancy.

In announcing selection of the Westinghouse Building, the judges said that the "Harrison and Abramowitz design was a very strong expression of the resurgence of the Pittsburgh central business district. Its dramatic impact from the westerly approaches to the city serves as a constant reminder of the growth and dynamism of Pittsburgh."

Some unusual features of the Westinghouse building drew particular comment. Integrity of design was cited for the building's distinctive appearance which is so compatible with the broad plazas and attractive vistas of the Center, and architecturally harmonious with other buildings in the development.

Operation of the building, reflecting Westinghouse's chief manufacturing interest, is totally electrical. No other source of energy has been used.

A Westinghouse developed water-cooled fluorescent lighting system reduces the air conditioning load in summer and puts heat from the fixtures to work in winter. It marks the first use of such a system anywhere.

A modular wall system, also developed by Westinghouse, can be taken down, moved and re-erected easily, quickly and inexpensively, permitting complete flexibility of occupancy as business requirements change from time to time.

Wide corridors, open to the exterior through large windows on all four sides of the building, present an almost constant panorama of rivers, hills, plazas, fountains, gardens and the impressive skyline of the city.

Suppliers to the Westinghouse Building represent an imposing roster of local Pittsburgh industries. Largest single supplier of mechanical and electrical equipment was Westinghouse itself with elevators, electric stairways, heat exchangers, motors and controls, transformers, switchgear, refrigerators, water coolers, and other systems and components as well as lighting fixtures and modular walls.

Structural steel came from American Bridge Division of U.S. Steel Corporation. Curtain walls and subflooring duct systems were supplied by H. H. Robertson Company. PPG Industries provided all glass and glazing. George A. Fuller, Inc., was the general contractor; Schneider, Inc., the mechanical contractor; and Lord Electric Company, the electrical contractor.

Surprise selections in a city noted for its "building renaissance" were the two older buildings which received honorable mention. The judges, however, were greatly impressed by the delightful old Triangle Building. "It takes real courage to effect the extensive renovation and interior modernization of so old a building. Yet by so doing, Kenneth Goldsmith, president of K. Goldsmith & Co., deserves considerable credit for recognizing and preserving the building heritage of Pittsburgh."

The stately Henry W. Oliver Building was praised as "exceptionally well-managed with an unexcelled character of tenancy that reflects the quality of its 60-year ownership by the Oliver Tyrone Corporation."

Judges for the awards were Laurence C. Wolfe, American Institute of Architects; Edgar J. Driscoll, Jr., American Newspaper Publishers Association; and John Robert White, American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers.

**COURTESY FOR THE NONSMOKER**

**HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in a recent survey conducted by the Government, it was found that over 43 percent of all airline passengers felt that smokers should be separated from nonsmokers while traveling on airplanes. The sizable minority includes a great many smokers as well as almost all the nonsmokers surveyed.

In an era when the rights of neglected minorities are being so strongly advocated, I think it is time that Congress rallied to the defense of the nonsmoker. A recent study released by the Surgeon General has proven that the effects of prolonged secondary smoke inhalation can cause serious damage to the health of nonsmokers who are forced to inhale the noxious fumes of a nearby smoker. Why, then, should these people who have voluntarily chosen not to subject their bodies to the detrimental effects of smoking, be involuntarily subjected to the same while traveling in public transportation.

In view of all these facts, I am calling for prompt action on H.R. 4776, my nonsmokers relief bill, which is currently before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This legislation provides a workable and just solution to this problem, for while it calls for separate areas for nonsmokers on planes, trains, and buses, it in no way causes a hardship on the rights of the smoker.

The Christian Science Monitor recently published an editorial which vividly depicts the abuses which nonsmokers are continually subjected to while traveling aboard public transportation. Although, as the article states, several companies in the transportation industry have voluntarily adopted the requisites of the Nonsmokers Relief Act, and in doing so have met with great success, there is no reason why all passengers should not have the same protection of their rights. If nothing else, it is a simple and long-overdue courtesy to the nonsmoker.

For your further information, I have taken the liberty of enclosing the article from the Christian Science Monitor:

**COURTESY FOR NONSMOKERS**

(By Clive Lawrence)

NEW YORK.—Two men get into a Long Island Rail Road coach. One of them lights a cigarette and blows a pall of smoke. The other says, "Would you mind not blowing your smoke over me?"

"Where do you expect me to blow it?"

"I don't care where you blow it, buster..."

The argument escalates and before long the men are exchanging blows. The police are called.

Smoker-nonsmoker confrontation, not always so extreme, is not confined to railroads but is to be found on airlines and in other public places as well. It stems from a basic issue of individual rights raised in a report on smoking just issued by the U.S. surgeon general.

The report referred to possible harmful effect on nonsmokers due to carbon monoxide and other substances in tobacco smoke. The passenger who challenges the smoker beside him—or complains to conductor or stewardess—is more likely to be just plain irritated by all that smoke. He feels his own rights are infringed. And his numbers are increasing.

**FRICTION BLOWS OVER**

Long Island Rail Road officials say there were constant altercations and many fist fights between smokers and nonsmokers—until seven months ago.

Now, they say, all is changed. Smokers and nonsmokers are riding their trains happily. Seven months ago the railroad had a policy of allowing smoking in every second car. But apparently there were more nonsmokers, or even smokers did not like traveling in fume-filled cars.

After continuous trouble and widespread complaints the railroad took a survey.

The result was an "overwhelming vote for no smoking or curtailed smoking," said a railroad spokesman.

The railroad now reserves only two cars—the first and last—for smokers.

This policy was started in spring last year, and after a small flurry of complaints from smokers the railroad reports it has worked well.

#### PENN CENTRAL POLICY

A spokesman for the Penn Central Railroad said that for as far back as he could remember the railroad has reserved 12 out of 16 cars for nonsmokers. In recent years, however, smoking or nonsmoking cars have been more clearly designated.

He said the policy is working well. Penn Central has had very few complaints. If people smoke in nonsmoking cars they are generally told to stop by the conductor.

He said he does not think the surgeon general's report will alter Penn Central's policy.

A Connecticut man who has ridden the trains for 20 years told this correspondent that there is "less and less smoking. It's not the problem it used to be." He thinks the change began about two years ago, and following a Penn Central questionnaire about a year ago, it was his impression that railroad officials had become "more sensitive to nonsmokers' demands."

However, another correspondent for this newspaper who rode from New York to Boston recently found that conductors may not always enforce the rule. When a cloud of smoke wafted over her chair she asked the two smokers responsible if they knew they were in a nonsmoking car.

They replied, "Yes, but the conductor told us it would be all right to smoke."

American Airlines says it reserves about 50 percent of seats for nonsmokers. When a passenger reports at the gate he is asked his preference. This policy was started 1½ years ago in the jumbo 747's and extended to all aircraft a few months later, as it proved very popular.

An airline spokesman says American has had no complaints. He said the airline would increase the proportion for nonsmokers if more people asked for it.

Trans World Airlines has reserved seats for nonsmokers for the past year. The number varies with each aircraft and flight, but the proportion generally favors the smoker. Trans World has had no complaints, a spokesman said.

Passengers are asked their preference and there are normally "ample seats available in nonsmoker areas."

The TWA spokesman said that, since airplane air-conditioning systems prevent smoke from drifting to nonsmoker seats, he does not think the surgeon general's report will affect the airline. An American Airlines spokesman took the same position.

Eastern Air Lines does not have segregated seats for smokers and nonsmokers. Eastern's engineers figure that efficient ventilation obviates any harmful effects from fumes. However, anyone sitting next to a smoker and wishing to move is given courteous consideration by stewardesses, said a spokesman, himself an avid non-smoker. He could not recall having had any complaints from nonsmokers flying Eastern.

Pan American World Airways has provided seats for nonsmokers for the past two years. On the 747, 20 out of 299 seats are set aside for nonsmokers in the economy section, and 6 out of 38 in the first class.

Though the proportion favors the smoker Pan Am officials say the policy is working well. The proportion of nonsmoker seats in other Pan Am aircraft varies, but is in general slightly higher than that in the 747's.

Pan Am does not have plans to change this policy.

United Air Lines, said a spokesman, feels

its policy of making about half the seats available to nonsmokers has worked well for six months. No change is planned.

At the moment Braniff International Airways has nonsmoking seats in its 747—12 out of 40 seats in first class and 35 out of 300 in economy class. This is flexible, however, and more nonsmoking seats can be made available if requested.

This policy has been working well, the airline says, for 1½ years.

There are no nonsmoking seats in Braniff's other aircraft, spokesmen say, as there does not seem to be a need for them. If a need is clearly indicated, they add, seats for nonsmokers could be provided.

All airlines contacted for this survey said the surgeon general's report does not affect their policies. They said that the ventilation system in aircraft is so efficient that it prevents drifting smoke.

### NEWS BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

#### HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to help communicate bicentennial activity I am inserting into the RECORD the weekly news bulletin compiled and written by the communications committee staff of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission—ARBC: AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION NEWS BULLETIN, JANUARY 24, 1972

President Nixon said in his State of the Union address last week that he would propose bold new plans for the physical and social development of Washington, D.C. as part of the nation's bicentennial. "In this and other ways we will make that celebration both a fitting commemoration of our revolutionary origins and a bold further step to fulfill their promise," the President told Congress.

The Baltimore Sun reported last week that planning has begun for Baltimore's 1976 national bicentennial celebration with indications that city fathers will push for completion of the showcase inner harbor phase I and parts of the downtown metro center by that time. Mayor Schaefer has announced that Walter S. Orlinsky, city council president, will coordinate the city's bicentennial efforts. Mr. Orlinsky stated he plans to make the celebration in Baltimore "a year-long city fair" with participation of both local ethnic groups and their national counterparts.

ARBC philatelic advisory panel chairman John C. Chapin, special assistant to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, announced that at the third business meeting on January 17, panelist Fred Korotkin revealed that the American unit of the American Topical Association is preparing a world-wide list of stamp issues relating to the bicentennial. Panelist Jacques Minkus discussed the book he is publishing on people and places that have contributed to the American heritage.

The York County (Va.) citizen's group to plan the bicentennial in coordination with the Virginia Peninsula action team (P-Bat) held an organizational meeting on January 19. The role of P-Bat is to stir local interest in the bicentennial. Organization at the county level is planned to involve youth and women groups, the military, civic organizations and businessmen, churches, town trustees, the park service and minority groups.

ARBC member Dr. Paul Smith recently told

a California group, "the best way to profit from the occasion of our 200th birthday is to make a checklist of what we are, what we have, where we have been, and where we need to go." Dr. Smith continued, "when people think of 1776, they normally concentrate on places like Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. We must remember that lots of things were going on in California when the Declaration of Independence was signed."

The Rose Bowl Parade float representing the city of Montebello (Calif.) entitled "A Salute to 1976—200th Birthday" depicted the American flag and was made from flowers from every State in the Union. The Governors of all fifty States responded to the city's invitation to send a representative State flower. Montana's Governor, Forrest Anderson, attended the Rose Bowl and brought with him his State's contribution, some pressed bitter root, a spring blooming mountain wild flower. "There have been too many flag burnings and up-sidedown flags," Chairman Denton Guthrie of the Montebello Float Committee said. "We want to show everybody what a truly grand old flag it has been for the last 196 years and we are looking forward to its 200th birthday in 1976."

Two teenagers have been proposed by the town supervisor as members for the Oyster Bay (N.Y.) ARBC. If approved the youths will join the 14-member commission chaired by Dorothy Horton McGee of Locust Valley, N.Y. One of the youths is an American history Buff and was motivated by summer employment at the Bethage Village Restoration project.

Winterset, Iowa (Madison County) Future Farmers of America have established a program of beautification for the county. The program, called "Route 76" can be identified by the Interstate road sign in red, white, and blue, which the group has adopted as its logo. To date the FFA have torn down six wood frame buildings that were eye sores to Winterset; cleaned up miles of county highway, an effort which will continue through 1976; moved one abandoned auto off the roadway to the junk yard. The Iowa State Commission under the leadership of Bob Dillon, chairman, and Ken Fulk, Executive Secretary is encouraging the State FFA to adopt a similar program in all Iowa counties.

Representatives of the Denver Olympic Committee with Colorado Governor John Love are attending the Winter Olympic Games in Sapporo, Japan. The group will meet with the International Olympic Committee to report progress in planning, site selection, environmental research and the financial outlook for the '76 Winter Games in Denver. Meanwhile, it has been reported that another group calling itself "Citizens for Colorado's Future (CCF)", a recently organized opposition committee, tentatively plans to send its own delegation to Sapporo to try to convince the IOC the games are not wanted in Colorado. CCF had written IOC Chairman Avery Brundage seeking a meeting to express its views, but the correspondence dated January 13, has not been answered.

The Association of General Contractors of America, Inc., whose membership exceeds 9,000 building contracting companies is considering enlarging their "Build a Beautiful America Program" to be a bicentennial project. They have invited the ARBC to acquaint their membership with the goals of the bicentennial commission at the next convention of the association, March 3-9, in Houston. The contractors represent another association who are getting involved.

The Virginia Independence Bicentennial Commission has approved a debate tournament at Williamsburg among high school debaters from the 13 original colonies as part of the national bicentennial commemoration.

The South Dakota Bicentennial Commission at their recent meeting revived a proposal to place an imprint of the Mount

Rushmore Memorial on the \$2 bill if the U.S. Treasury decides to redevelop this now obsolete denomination. The commission feels that the suggestion would fit into the pattern of events scheduled for Mount Rushmore's bicentennial observance. They stated that it would be proper recognition nationally of the memorial's significance as part of the American scene.

A recent editorial appearing in the Buffalo (N.Y.) News on the bicentennial and the recent selection of Niagara Falls as a bicentennial city stated: "Since the invitation is out to all communities to plan their own suitable events, why shouldn't Buffalo and Erie County set about with some civic barnstorming—not to compete with Niagara Falls, but to focus on this region's historic role as a canal era gateway to the west, its key location on the world's longest stretch of undefended international boundary, or its significant early role in the air age? Or just as appropriately, why not some brainstorming by a suitable city-county committee of citizens to explore current metropolitan self-improvement goals or civil contributions—that might mark Buffalo as a focal point in a national rededication to advancement in the quality of life?" That's the spirit, Buffalo News!

#### END TO TAX SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

**HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great volume of mail we all receive, it may well be that many Members never saw, or do not now recall the very excellent letter sent last month to every Member of Congress from the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association here in Washington, an organization to which I am proud to belong, along with a petition from the Association urging an end to tax support of higher education institutions which refuse to permit defense-related programs and activities to exist on campus, or fail to protect them from such harassment that they are unable to carry on effectively. This is exactly the kind of straight talk we expect from Marines—and every Member of this body ought to pay careful heed to it. For my part, I think we should do exactly what the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association suggests.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE OFFICERS  
ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Traditionally, the institutions of higher learning in the United States have made a unique and vital contribution to the security of our Country.

While other countries, differently conceived, have permitted their campuses to become sanctuaries for seditious mischief, American colleges have provided vast numbers of civilian educated military leaders in reserve, and conducted research of inestimable value to our national defense.

The role of these civilian oriented leaders in augmenting our armed services in times of need, and the stability their good influences have afforded this Republic, is, we believe, supremely significant.

Recent events on certain college campuses have, deplorably, indicated a departure from this worthy tradition.

Officer training facilities and programs have been destroyed and disrupted; recruit-

ing representatives have been harassed and banished; defense related research has been intimidated and impeded.

Notwithstanding other acknowledged circumstances, we cannot hold blameless the college administrators where this has happened. If they have not been sympathetic with these dissidents, they certainly have been timorous and vacillating in dealing with them.

#### PETITION

Whereas, public institutions exist to serve the public interest; and

Whereas, public funds should be spent only to further that interest; and

Whereas, billions of dollars of tax-extracted monies are being appropriated for institutions of higher learning; and

Whereas, the national security of the United States is of the highest public interest.

Therefore, we the members of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association respectfully petition the Congress of the United States, to take every possible measure to ensure that the people's monies are not expended to institutions that fail to make their proper contribution to "the common defense" of this Republic.

#### SUIT TO COMPEL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY FROM DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have this week joined with the environmental defense fund in a suit against Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe, designed to compel the Secretary to file reports on the impact on the environment of forthcoming highway construction proposals, as required by Federal law—Civil Action No. 151-72, U.S. District Court, Washington, D.C.

The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 and the act of 1965 require the Secretary of Transportation to report his recommendations for the apportionment of funds and matching requirements for work on Federal-aid highway, the functional realignment of the Federal-aid highway systems, and his estimates of future highway needs of the Nation in January 1972. The Secretary's recommendations in the past have had a direct bearing on the highway legislation passed by the Congress.

In 1970, the Congress enacted the National Environmental Policy Act—NEPA—which directs all Federal Government agencies to "include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislation and other major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment" a detailed statement on the environmental impact of the proposed project, including a statement of "any adverse environmental effects" and "any irreversible or irretrievable resource commitments."

The intent of the Congress in passing NEPA was to insure that before the Congress passes on legislation which significantly affects the environment, it have

a detailed understanding of what that proposal will mean for the environment.

I have joined in this suit because I have been informed that Secretary Volpe will soon send to the Congress his highway report including recommendations for a continuing highway program to extend to 1990 but without any environmental impact statement.

In my estimation, no program has had a more immediate impact on the environment and health of Americans than Department of Transportation's highway construction program. This program has resulted in thoughtless misuse of precious land resources, disastrous air pollution, and unregulated consumption of a limited fuel supply, and has paved the way for traffic accidents in which thousands of Americans have been killed or seriously injured.

The Congress cannot make plans for any far-reaching extension of the construction project without detailed information on the impact it will have on the environment. A meaningful impact statement accompanying highway recommendations should address itself to evaluating the future effect such construction will have on problems such as urban decay and suburban sprawl, air pollution, land use and consumption of natural resources. As a Member of Congress, I need this information as a basis for legislation I intend to introduce relating to future highway programs and in order to make responsible judgments on such legislation coming before the House.

It appears that Secretary Volpe is following the Nixon administration's practice of ignoring instructions of Congress. The President has said he will not be bound by the Mansfield amendment and Secretary Volpe has chosen to ignore the requirements of the Environmental Policy Act. Both are breaking the law.

Therefore, I have decided to join in a law suit in Federal District Court for the District of Columbia against Mr. Volpe. That suit seeks a court order directing the Secretary of Transportation to include an environmental impact statement with each recommendation at the time of its submission to the Congress, and a declaratory judgment to the effect that each recommendation is required to include an impact statement so that the NEPA requirement will be clearly understood with regard to future submissions to the Congress.

Following is the text of the complaint and exhibits:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., 1712 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, and Jonathan B. Bingham, 5000 Independence Avenue, The Bronx, New York and Edward L. Koch, 14 Washington Place, New York, New York 10003, Plaintiffs v. John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590, Defendant—Civil No. 151-72

1. This is an action arising under 23 U.S. Secs. 101 et seq. (Highways); the Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. Secs. 1651 et seq.; The Highway Revenue Act of 1956, P.L. 84-627, as amended; the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970, P.L. 91-605; the Act of August 28, 1965, 89-139; the National En-

Environmental Policy Act of 1969, P.L. 91-190, 42 U.S.C. Secs. 4321 *et seq.*; the Declaratory Judgments Act, 28 U.S.C. Secs. 2201-2202; and the Fifth and Ninth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

2. The jurisdiction of this Court is conferred by 5 U.S.C. Secs. 731-706 (Administrative Procedure Act); 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1331 (Federal Question); 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1337 (Commerce Clause); 28 U.S.C. Secs. 2201-2202 (Declaratory Judgments); and 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1361 (Mandamus). The amount in controversy, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds ten thousand dollars.

3. Plaintiff Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. ("EDF") is a non-profit public-benefit membership corporation organized and operated under the laws of the State of New York. EDF's members are scientists, lawyers, and other citizens of the United States. Among its objectives and purposes, EDF is dedicated to, and its major activities are directed toward, the preservation and enhancement of the environment including, but not limited to, the enhancement of air quality, water quality, the quality of the urban environment, protection of the public from noise pollution, conservation of finite natural resources, and protection of the public from environmental health hazards. EDF has demonstrated ability to present scientific and other testimony before administrative agencies and courts of law. EDF's members pay federal taxes which are specifically earmarked for highway construction pursuant to the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, P.L. 84-627, as amended.

4. EDF brings this action pursuant to Rule 23 (a) and (b) (1) and (2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on its own behalf and on behalf of all persons in the United States whose environment is vulnerable to significant impact resulting from the construction of highways financed in whole or in part with Federal monies. EDF sues on behalf of this class because (1) the class is so numerous that joinder of all parties is impracticable; (2) there are questions of law and fact common to all members of the class; (3) the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the class would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the defendant; and (4) a class action is the fairest and most efficient method of adjudicating the controversy.

5. Plaintiff Jonathan B. Bingham is a Member of the United States House of Representatives, representing the 23rd District of New York.

6. Plaintiff Edward I. Koch is a Member of the United States House of Representatives representing the 17th District of New York.

7. Defendant John A. Volpe is the Secretary of Transportation of the United States. He is sued as an individual and in his official capacity.

8. Under 23 U.S.C. Secs. 101 *et seq.*; 49 U.S.C. Secs. 1651 *et seq.*; the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970, P.L. 91-605; and the Act of August 28, 1965, P.L. 89-139, defendant Volpe is charged with various duties with respect to Federal programs for the funding of highway construction, including the general duty of administering such programs.

9. Among his duties, defendant Volpe is required to make certain reports and recommendations to Congress with respect to such programs, as follows:

a. Section 105(b)(2) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970, P.L. 91-605, directs that:

"By January 1, 1972, the Secretary [of Transportation] shall report to Congress on his recommendation for the apportionment of funds and matching requirements for work on Federal-aid highways in States which have completed, or are nearing completion, of construction on Interstate System mileage [as defined in 23 U.S.C. Sec. 103(d)], as

amended] located in their State, and for all States after completion of the Interstate System."

b. Section 3 of the Act of August 28, 1965, P.L. 89-139, directs that:

"It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary [of Transportation] acting under authority of existing law and through the Bureau of Public Roads, shall report to Congress in January 1968, and in January of every second year thereafter, his estimates of the future highway needs of the Nation."

c. Section 121(a) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970, P.L. 91-605, directs that:

"The Secretary of Transportation shall develop and include in the report of [sic] Congress required to be submitted in January 1972, by section 3 of the Act of August 28, 1965 (79 Stat. 578; Public Law 89-139), specific recommendations for the functional realignment of the Federal-aid [highway] systems. These recommendations shall be based on the functional classification study made in cooperation with the State highway departments and local governments as required by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 and submitted to the Congress in 1970, and the functional classification study now underway of the Federal-aid systems in 1990."

d. Section 121(b) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970, P.L. 91-605, directs that:

"As a part of the future highway needs report to be submitted to Congress in January 1972, the Secretary [of Transportation] shall also make recommendations to the Congress for a continuing Federal-aid highway program for the period 1976 to 1990. The needs estimates to be used in developing such programs shall be in conformance with the functional classification studies referred to in subsection (a) of this section and the recommendations for the functional realignment required by such subsection."

10. Each of the recommendations specified in Paragraph 9 "a" through "d" above (hereinafter, collectively, the "Recommendations"), has been required by Congress for the specific purpose of furnishing a basis for possible legislation. For example, House Report No. 91-1554, prepared by the Committee on Public Works, explains the requirements of Sec. 121 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970, set out in Paragraph 9 "c" and "d", above, as follows:

"The committee feels that with the Interstate program nearing an end, steps must be taken now to assure that the future highway needs of the Nation are thoroughly considered and studied before undertaking the specifics of the new highway program. The study and recommendations required by this section will provide an important tool to Congress for making intelligent decisions concerning future highway needs of the country."

11. Each of the Recommendations has a direct bearing on possible legislation which would significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

12. Sec. 202(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. Sec. 4332(2)(C) (NEPA) directs that:

"all agencies of the Federal Government shall . . . include in every recommendation or report on proposals for legislations and other major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official on—

"(i) the environmental impact of the proposed action,

"(ii) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented,

"(iii) alternatives to the proposed action,

"(iv) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and

"(v) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be in-

involved in the proposed action should it be implemented. Prior to making any detailed statement, the responsible Federal official shall consult with and obtain the comments by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of such statement and the comments and views of the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, which are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, shall be made available to the President, the Council on Environmental Quality and to the public as provided by Section 552 of Title 5, United States Code, and shall accompany the proposal through the existing agency review processes."

Sec. 102(2)(D) of NEPA directs that all agencies of the Federal Government shall: "study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources."

13. In letters to defendant Volpe dated November 24, 1971 and December 22, 1971, EDF, through its attorney, stated that in EDF's opinion the Recommendations specified in Paragraph 9, "a", "b" and "d" above, are each recommendations or reports on proposals for legislation which would significantly affect the human environment, so as to require the inclusion of a detailed environmental impact statement by the responsible official, in satisfaction of Sec. 102(2)(C) of NEPA, (hereinafter an "Impact Statement"). EDF requested that certain specified categories of environmental impact which result from highway construction be fully discussed in the Impact Statements required with respect to these Recommendations. These letters are appended hereto as Exhibits "A" and "B".

14. EDF has never received a reply to these two letters, over a period of two months since the first of them was written, although various officials of the Department of Transportation have informally acknowledged receipt of, and familiarity with, the letters.

15. Each of the Recommendations, in addition to being a recommendation or report on proposals for legislation, is also a formulation of agency policy with respect to projects and continuing activities supported in whole or in part with Federal monies, which would significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

16. Pursuant to Section 5 of the Council on Environmental Quality's *Guidelines for Statements on Proposed Federal Actions Affecting the Environment*, 36 Fed. Register 7724-29, April 23, 1971, Federal "actions" which require Impact Statements if they significantly affect the quality of the human environment—

"include but are not limited to . . .  
"(ii) projects and continuing activities . . . supported in whole or in part through Federal contracts, grants, subsidies, loans or other forms of funding assistance . . . [and]  
"(iii) policy. . ."

17. Plaintiff Bingham intends to propose legislation in the current session of Congress with respect to Federal transportation policy, including Federal funding of highway construction. He intends to rely in part on the Impact Statements required by law to be included in the Recommendations, for material that will enable other Members of Congress to make informed appraisals of his proposed legislation.

18. Plaintiff Koch has proposed legislation in the present Session of Congress with respect to Federal transportation policy, including Federal funding of highway construction. He intends to rely in part on the Impact Statements required by law to be included in the Recommendations, for material that will enable other Members of Congress to make informed appraisals of his proposed legislation.

19. At the present date, the January 1, 1972 deadline for the Recommendation

specified in Paragraph 9 "a", above is more than three weeks past. Neither the Recommendation nor an accompanying Impact Statement has yet been submitted to Congress as required by law.

20. On information and belief, defendant Volpe has determined not to include Impact Statements with any of the Recommendations.

21. If defendant Volpe submits the Recommendations to Congress without including Impact Statements therewith, the effect will be unlawfully to deprive Congress and the public of the opportunity for a full and informed assessment of the environmental consequences of these Recommendations, and of proposed legislation relating thereto. If defendant Volpe submits any or all of the Recommendations to Congress without including Impact Statements therewith, plaintiff EDF and the members of the class on whose behalf it brings this suit, and plaintiffs Bingham and Koch, will suffer irreparable harm, for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

Wherefore, plaintiffs EDF, Bingham and Koch respectfully request that this Court grant the following relief:

(A) A preliminary mandatory injunction directing defendant Volpe to include an Impact Statement with each of the Recommendations at the time of its submission to Congress.

(B) A declaratory judgment to the effect that each of the Recommendations is required to include an Impact Statement at the time of its submission to Congress, and that the biennial report specified in Paragraph 9 "b", above, will be required to include an Impact Statement at the time of each future submission to Congress.

(C) A permanent mandatory injunction directing defendant Volpe to include with each of the Recommendations, at the time of its submission to Congress, an Impact Statement.

(D) Retention of jurisdiction over this action until the adequacy of the Impact Statements submitted to Congress with respect to the Recommendations can be determined.

(E) Such further relief as this Court, in its discretion, may deem appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN F. HELLEGERS,

JOHN F. DIENELT,

ARNOLD P. LUTZKER,

Attorney for Jonathan B. Bingham and Edward I. Koch.

January 24, 1972.

CITY OF WASHINGTON,  
District of Columbia, ss:

I, John F. Hellegers, being first duly sworn, depose and say that I am employed as an attorney by the Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. ("EDF"); that I am attorney for EDF in the captioned action; that EDF is a corporation; that I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof, and that I verily believe the same to be true, on the basis of personal knowledge.

JOHN F. HELLEGERS.

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., 1712 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, and Jonathan B. Bingham, 133 Cannon Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515, and Edward I. Koch, 1134 Longworth Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515, Plaintiffs v. John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590, Defendant

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief were mailed, postage prepaid, this 24th day of January, 1972, to Mr. Arnold P. Lutz-

ker, Attorney for plaintiffs Jonathan B. Bingham and Edward I. Koch, 133 Cannon Building, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515; defendant John A. Volpe, individually and in his official capacity, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590; the United States Attorney, U.S. Court House, Washington, D.C. 20001; the Attorney General of the United States, 9th and Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C.; and the General Counsel, U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590.

JOHN F. HELLEGERS,

Attorney for Plaintiff Environmental Defense Fund, Inc.

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

#### ORDER

Environmental Defense Fund, Inc., 1712 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, and Jonathan B. Bingham, 133 Cannon Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., 20515, and Edward I. Koch, 1134 Longworth Building, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515, Plaintiffs v. John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590, Defendant.

It is hereby ordered that on this 24th day of January, 1972, the foregoing Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief be filed and entered as part of the record of this Court.

#### EXHIBIT A

##### ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND,

East Setauket, N.Y., November 24, 1971.

Secretary JOHN A. VOLPE,  
Department of Transportation,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY VOLPE: I am writing to you today about the future of the Interstate System of highways, on behalf of the Environmental Defense Fund. EDF is a nationwide coalition of scientists, lawyers, and other concerned citizens, now totaling more than 25,000 persons, dedicated to the preservation and enhancement of the human environment.

As you are aware, Section 105(b)(2) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 directs that: "By January 1, 1972, the Secretary [of Transportation] shall report to Congress on his recommendation for the apportionment of funds and matching requirements for work on Federal-aid highways in States which have completed, or are nearing completion, of construction on Interstate System mileage located in their State, and for all States after completion of the Interstate System."

This report, being essentially a "recommendation . . . for legislation" within the meaning of Section 102(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), is required to include a "detailed statement" on the environmental impact of the action you propose; adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided if it is implemented; alternatives to the proposed action; the relationship between local short term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long term productivity; and any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

It is widely acknowledged that few, if any, federal programs have had as significant an environmental impact as the Interstate Highway System. Some observers also view the System as the classic example of a program whose environmental costs went uncalculated before the decision was made to build it, and became evident only after the fact. *Fortune* magazine, for example, notes in its July 1971 issue that the System has

created "severe land use problems," and quotes Dr. Daniel P. Moynihan of Harvard, a former adviser to President Nixon, as saying that "if anyone had realized the sheer magnitude of the interests affected by this road system, it is impossible to imagine that it would ever have been built."

This pattern of leaping first and looking later, of course, was exactly what NEPA was intended to put a stop to; Congress recognized that the environmental and other costs of such action are simply too high.

Since NEPA requires that your forthcoming report include a detailed environmental impact statement, I trust that you will take this occasion to look carefully at the environmental consequences that will follow from further highway building under a program resembling the present one.

At a minimum, I trust that you will present Congress and the American people with at least the following:

First, a thorough discussion of the downtown decay and suburban sprawl which result from building highways in and around cities. Although Section 6(a)(11) of the Council on Environmental Quality's *Guidelines* for preparing NEPA statements plainly mandates discussion of these and related land use problems, they are rarely, if ever, given meaningful consideration in NEPA statements pertaining to highways. Mention is never made of the tendency of highways to draw commerce, jobs, population, and tax base away from central cities, so that, in *Fortune's* words, "the Interstate has made millions of Americans into new commuters, . . . [while] ghetto dwellers, who lack transportation to suburban factories, are rapidly losing job opportunities." I have yet to see mention of the erosion of municipal services and amenities that accompanies this shift. Mention is never made of the excessive costs of providing water, fire protection, sewerage, education, and other services to areas of low density residential development, or of the environmental and aesthetic price that we all pay as more and more open land disappears to make way for hamburger palaces, motels, and the endless sprawl of what Louis Mumford calls "mass suburbia," an inhuman "anti-city." Nor have I ever seen mention in such a statement of the exacerbated racial tensions that result as inner-cities become islands of black and ethnic poverty. Reading these highway impact statements, in fact, one would never guess that highways are a major determinant of land use patterns at all. I hope that your forthcoming statement on the future of the System will serve to focus attention on these critical consequences of highway building, and provide a model for compliance with Section 6(a)(11) of the *Guidelines* that will serve to upgrade the statements now prepared as to individual highways all across the country.

Second, I trust that your statement will discuss the demands which continued highway building, and continued massive reliance on the private automobile, will place on our oil supply, and on the consequences to be expected in terms of further oil spills, desertification of drilling areas (including shorelines and wilderness) and heightened pressure for the wholesale strip mining of coal as we drain away our oil reserves.

Third, I expect that you will discuss the air pollution that can be expected to result from more highways and more cars, taking into account not only hoped-for emission controls, but also the effect of growth in the total number of cars. In particular it is necessary to discuss whether further highway building in urban areas, or in areas that are likely to become urbanized, is consistent with meeting air quality standards promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency under Section 109 of the Clean Air Act.

Fourth, I expect that there will be a discussion of the massive toll that reliance on the private automobile takes in terms of

death and severe injury. Freedom from need-less risk of being killed or maimed, of course, is one of the most important aspects of a viable human environment. In this context automobile accident rates should be weighted against those for alternative forms of transportation, such as rail transit. It does not suffice simply to point out that accident rates are higher or lower on certain types of roads than on certain others; the point is that to the extent that people are made dependent on cars by the building of more highways and the disappearance of other forms of transportation, they are correspondingly deprived of the right to avoid this national automotive "demolition derby."

I look forward to your statement.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. HELLEGERS,  
Staff Attorney.

#### EXHIBIT B

ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND,  
East Setauket, N.Y., Dec. 22, 1971.

Secretary JOHN A. VOLPE,  
Department of Transportation,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VOLPE: As you will recall, I wrote to you on November 24, 1971, pointing out that Section 105(b)(2) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 requires you to report to Congress by the first of the year on your—"recommendation for the apportionment of funds and matching requirements for work on Federal-aid highways in States which have completed, or are nearing completion, of construction on Interstate System mileage located in their State, and for all States after completion of the Interstate System."

I noted that this is essentially a "recommendation . . . for legislation" within the meaning of Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act, so that by the plain requirement of that Act, it must be accompanied by a "detailed statement" with respect to the environmental impact of what you recommend; adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided if your recommendation is implemented; alternatives to the proposed action; the relationship between local short term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long term productivity; and any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

The balance of my letter was devoted to setting forth a few of the considerations that ought to be discussed in the required environmental impact statement. Some of these considerations were concisely summarized in your own speech of February 4, 1971, before the Transportation Association of America in Chicago where you observed that:

"Our obsession with the private car is destroying the quality of life in our urban areas. . . . Finally it involves all of us in a brutally vicious cycle: more people, with fewer alternatives [of ways to travel] means more cars—which require more roads—which take more urban and suburban land off the tax rolls and away from housing, business, and recreation while bringing increased pollution and congestion. This, very simply, is a self-perpetuating disaster."

The purpose of my present letter is to point out that in addition to the legislative proposal on the future of this "disaster" which you are required to make under Section 105 (b)(2) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970, above:

Section 121(b) of the same Act requires that "In January 1972" you "shall also make recommendations to the Congress for a continuing Federal-aid highway program for the period 1976 to 1990;" and

Section 3 of the Act of August 28, 1965, 79 Stat. 578; Public Law 89-139, provides that "It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary . . . shall report to Congress in January, 1968, and in January of every second year

thereafter, his estimates of the future highway needs of the Nation."

Needless to say, the legislative recommendations required by these Sections must also be accompanied by an environmental impact statement pursuant to Section 102 (2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act.

We trust that each of these legislative recommendations—the one required by the first of the year under Section 105(b)(2), and the ones required during January under the latter two provisions—will be accompanied by a full discussion of the issues listed in my previous letter, including land use consequences of further highway construction; the drain on our fuel supplies to be expected from further massive reliance on highways and on the private automobile; the air pollution that can be expected from more highways and more cars; and the toll that these highways and cars can be expected to take in human life and limb.

This list, of course, is not an exhaustive one, but we believe that it sets forth a few of the more important issues that the National Environmental Policy Act requires you to analyze.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. HELLEGERS,  
Staff Attorney.

### HENRY KISSINGER: THE MAN WHO CONTROLS THE DESTINY OF AMERICA

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

MR. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, events of the past day indicate even more clearly than before that Henry Kissinger is privy to state secrets denied the Members of the Congress and the American people. It seems as if the President believes that he and Dr. Kissinger can, acting in secret, determine the future course of America.

I, for one, am convinced that this country is too great and its liberties too precious to be entrusted to the minds of two men—President Nixon and his alter ego, Henry Kissinger. This Congress and the American people have the right to know.

Had President Nixon told the American people the truth some 30 months ago, this country would not be so polarized, so divided. The truth is that much of the confusion in America results from deliberate, political maneuvering on the part of the President.

The American people have the right to know the truth about Henry Kissinger, this man who is above congressional investigation, who is not answerable to the people or to their elected representatives.

The American people have the right to know who this Henry Kissinger is and what entitles him to be set above other men. I include two interesting articles delineating the true nature of this man and his relationship to the President in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, July 11, 1971]

HENRY KISSINGER: NIXON'S METTERNICH  
(By David Landau)

(The writer is managing editor of the Harvard Crimson, in which the following ap-

peared as part of a series of three articles on the career of Henry A. Kissinger.)

"He was a rococo figure, complete finely carved, all surface, like an intricately cut prism. His face was delicate but without depth, his conversation brilliant but without ultimate seriousness. Equally at home in the salon and in the Cabinet, he was the *beau-ideal* of [an] aristocracy which justifies itself not by its truth but by its existence. And if he never came to terms with the new age it was not because he failed to understand its seriousness but because he disdained it."

With these words, a Harvard thesis-writer named Henry Kissinger introduced Clemens Metternich, Austria's greatest foreign minister. Metternich was a man whom Kissinger emulated, whose diplomatic life he has sought to relieve. And the comparison of the two is far from inapt.

As Richard Nixon's most influential adviser on foreign policy, Kissinger has embodied the role of the 19th-century balance-of-power diplomat. He is cunning, elusive and all-powerful in the sprawling sector of government which seeks to advise the President on national security matters. As Mr. Nixon's personal emissary to foreign dignitaries, to academia and—as "a high White House official"—to the press, he is vague and unpredictable. Yet he is the single authoritative carrier of national policy besides the President himself.

Like the Austrian minister who became his greatest political hero, Kissinger has used his position in government as a protective cloak to conceal his larger ambitions and purposes. Far from being the detached, objective arbiter of presidential decision-making, he has become a crucial molder and supporter of Mr. Nixon's foreign policy. Instead of merely holding the bureaucracy at comfortable arm's length, he has entangled it in a web of useless projects and studies, cleverly shifting an important locus of advisory power from the Cabinet departments to his own office. And as confidential adviser to the President, he never speaks for the record, cannot be made to testify before Congress, and is identified with presidential policy only on a semi-public level.

#### A CONSTITUENCY OF ONE

Like the ministers who ruled post-Napoleonic Europe from the conference table at Vienna—and the Eastern Establishment figures who preceded him as policy-maker of a later age—Kissinger believes that legislative bodies, bureaucracies and run-of-the-mill citizenries all lack the training and temperament that are needed in the diplomatic field. He is only slightly less moved by the academics who parade down to Washington to peddle their ideas. And, when one sets aside popular opinion, Congress, the bureaucracy and the academic community, there remains the resident alone. The inescapable conclusion is that Henry Kissinger's only meaningful constituency is a constituency of one.

It might have seemed surprising that, only a month after his election, Mr. Nixon would have chosen one of his most vocal antagonists—the foreign policy adviser of his chief rival, Nelson Rockefeller—as a leading policy aide. But the two men had much more in common than anyone would have supposed.

To begin with, Mr. Nixon turned out not to be the partisan, suspect observer of the international scene whom Kissinger had so feared. Quite the contrary—Mr. Nixon was determined to take hold of the foreign policy machine and fashion his own commitment to world order, regardless of public and congressional opinion. In the past, decisions had been made in a chaotic, *ad hoc* atmosphere which lacked consistency and framework; the new President decided that such practice should cease.

For somewhat different reasons, Kissinger agreed that policy planning should be cen-

tered in the White House. For Kissinger, the balance-of-power diplomat, had long believed that world equilibrium was based on the constant threat of force, and that respect for the United States rested on the fear of its enormous military machine. At times, secret talks and well-placed overtures could avert military engagements that were not in the interest of the United States; at others, where an escalation to armed conflict seemed necessary, the decisions must be made and the orders carried out by a few top men who acted with the greatest of speed.

Such a policy of threat demanded a high degree of centralization—and the resulting Nixon-Kissinger policy structure was designed to circumvent those forces in government, such as Congress and the Cabinet bureaucrats, which were considered extraneous to that approach.

#### GUARDING CREDIBILITY

In addition, Kissinger realized that the policy of threat would be a failure if Mr. Nixon could not appear unfettered by others—inside Washington and out—who had claims on the President's conduct of foreign affairs. In as early a tract as "A World Restored," his 1954 Ph.D. thesis on Metternich and the restructuring of post-Napoleonic Europe, Kissinger had written that "the impetus of domestic policy is a direct social experience; but that of foreign policy is not actual, but potential experience—the threat of war—which statesmanship attempts to avoid being made explicit." In other words, popular opinion was little more than an encumbrance on those few who were capable of making decisions. For if the foreign diplomat were allowed to feel that the President's policy could be swayed by domestic upheavals, then the credibility of threat—the linchpin of the policy—would ultimately collapse.

Corollary to the policy of threat was the notion that the United States would keep its promises and fulfill its commitments no matter what the price. For the ultimate failure of diplomacy was to lose credibility, and there was a feeling for the honor of a great power that went very deep in Kissinger. There was the idea that a faulted credibility in one area of the world would surely lead to disaster in another, because for Kissinger all the great trouble spots of the world were lined up on a single continuum that connected the two superpowers: the Soviet Union and the United States. Should the Russians violate the ceasefire lines in the Mideast, then the President must be free to respond in Cambodia. And if the policy made no sense in cost-benefit analysis, at least it would proceed from strategic thinking which transcended the day-to-day pressures of political life.

#### WHITE HOUSE PREDOMINANCE

Kissinger felt that the presidency was the only office of government which could determine and execute foreign policy in the way it should properly be conducted. Congress was an impediment; its members, by and large, were not properly schooled in the hard-fought, intricate practice of diplomatic affairs and were more likely to respond to the uninformed concerns of their voters, to the shoddy tug-and-pull of the popular political process, than to the arduous twists and turns of great-power relationships. The bureaucracy, too, was an enemy; no imagination, no flair, no speed or adaptability, little grasp of the sacrifices and risks one must incur if the one were to maintain a flexible policy.

Kissinger, the balance-of-power diplomat, had long believed that world equilibrium was based on the constant threat of force, and that respect for the United States rested on the fear of its enormous military machine.

And as for popular opinion, Kissinger's interest lay not in how the votes would be cast today, but in how the executive structure would be affected by domestic reactions to the policy when that policy had finally run

its course five or ten years later. His overwhelming concern was how well the White House could continue to function as the major force in foreign policy, whether popular opinion would one day rise up and destroy the presidency as an instrument of diplomatic relations. And when Kissinger finally agreed to go to work for the man he had scorned as a presidential candidate, it was only on the condition that the policymaking structure be geared to White House predominance.

In a series of meetings at the end of November, 1968, Mr. Nixon invited Kissinger to accept the post of foreign policy assistant and proposed a revival of the National Security Council. Set up under Truman after World War II to coordinate policy planning, the NSC system had long since fallen into obscurity, but Mr. Nixon viewed it as an instrument of restoring to the White House a critical measure of flexibility and control over policy decisions. More than anything else, he dreaded being handed a single policy recommendation which, more often than not, might be a compromise policy, an effort on the part of several differing agencies which had subdued their disagreements and presented the White House with a position it could then only accept or reject.

Underlying the revived NSC structure was the so-called "options" system; the recommendations of each agency would be solicited by the White House and then screened for the NSC and the President by Kissinger and his staff.

As the "options" man, Kissinger would be expected to give a fair, objective account of each alternative; as confidential adviser to the President, his strength would rest more on his personal relationship with Mr. Nixon than on his policymaking abilities—a relationship that would have been very difficult to predict. "I suppose what really was clear was that Henry Kissinger did not intend to become a man of particular influence," Thomas Schelling, Kissinger's closest colleague on the Harvard faculty, said recently, "I think he honestly thought that there was a more detached role for himself." So Kissinger had gone to Washington to whittle down the options and strengthen Mr. Nixon's hand; his own influence could be determined only by the chemistry of his relationship with the President.

#### A TOWERING FIGURE

But for astute observers, the news of Kissinger's supremacy in foreign policy was not long in coming. In December, 1968, he flew to Key Biscayne to present Mr. Nixon with a set of blueprints for the revived NSC system—and William P. Rogers, the new Secretary of State, was already out in the cold. No longer would it be as necessary for the Secretary to meet with the President on an informal basis, as Acheson and Dulles and Rusk before him had done; like all other Cabinet members who dealt in foreign policy, his ideas would no longer be brought directly to Mr. Nixon, but would have to pass first through a system which Kissinger administered. And when Rogers met with the President and his national security adviser, he was completely overshadowed, so outclassed by Kissinger that he would rarely see Mr. Nixon in Kissinger's presence any more. "He avoids his confrontations with Henry because he knows he'll make a fool out of him," one State Department official said recently.

Kissinger was a towering figure amid the rest of the Nixon appointees. None could compare to him in terms of sheer mental preparation for the job. And it is probable that Kissinger came into his job better prepared than either of his predecessors under Kennedy and Johnson, not to mention those whom Mr. Nixon had just appointed to other, less rigorous posts, the men who had won their jobs as political favors, not by sheer intellectual breadth.

Most of the others in Mr. Nixon's retinue were men of politics, men who could be restrained by adverse domestic feeling or be deterred from a policy that seemed to make no material sense. But Mr. Nixon—a President determined to behave in a presidential way—and Kissinger, the great-power diplomat, would brook no compromise. And Mr. Nixon's personal relationship with Kissinger, unfettered as it was by ulterior political motives, became deep and profound. Kissinger is the President's only post-1960 acquaintance to have become a member of his personal inner circle. He sees Mr. Nixon more frequently than do any of his other appointees. And as Mr. Nixon's confidante, Kissinger passes the crucial judgments on the very options that he and his staff have laid out.

#### BUREAUCRATIC COUP

But Kissinger's coup of the Cabinet departments was not as simple as that. It involved a devious circumvention of the bureaucracy through the skillful use of study memoranda and detailed, lengthy questionnaires. According to several men who were close associates of Kissinger at the time, Kissinger came to power determined not to rely on normal channels for information concerning each of the policy undertakings. And so he proceeded to ensnare policy studies which left them very much on the short end of decision-making.

Kissinger's first act as Mr. Nixon's adviser was to commission an options memorandum on the progress of the war in Vietnam; he began work on the study as early as December, 1968. In the months preceding the study, the military state of affairs in Indochina had been the subject of a raging controversy inside the various departments. The outgoing presidential advisers and the upper crust of Washington's foreign service were claiming that the National Liberation Front had grown significantly weaker since the Tet offensive the previous February, that the Communist military campaign would fold in a matter of months. But the lower echelon—often closer to the truth than were their superiors—said that the guerrillas were merely regrouping forces and growing stronger all the time—that in effect, the entire American military effort had been a failure.

Since the higher-ranking officials had regularly suppressed the opposing view in their conversations with the White House, the consultants whom Kissinger had commissioned to write the study now felt it especially necessary to get word to Nixon of what the second group was saying—which was now possible for the first time, because Kissinger and the NSC were already committed to forego the compromise policy formula and unfold the disagreements for the President.

Kissinger's solution was to split the Vietnam memorandum in two; the first part would contain a list of options on what to do about Vietnam, and the second would be a list of specific questions on the progress of the war. It was the questions part of the study—the first, in what became known as National Security Study Memoranda (NSSM)—which Kissinger said had been designed to reveal the differing points of view. This he proposed to accomplish in an unprecedented way—by putting identical sets of questions to different departments, questions which, in the cases of most agencies, fell clearly outside their range of primary responsibility. The CIA, for example, was asked to file a report on the proficiency of Saigon's army—a task which had always belonged to the military command in Vietnam.

As for popular opinion, Kissinger's interest lay not in how the votes would be cast today, but in how the executive structure would be affected by domestic reactions to the policy when that policy had finally run its course five or ten years later.

One result of the questionnaire, undoubtedly

edly, was that many estimates suddenly became more honest; for example, the military command decided for the first time to abandon the "attrition" rationale for sustained U.S. ground action in Vietnam. In similar manner, the State and Defense Departments showed up each other's positions on the war.

#### TIED UP FOR MONTHS

But the major result of the questionnaire seems to have been that it tied up and discredited the bureaucracy as a whole. The higher-level officials were now as ashamed as their underlings, and entire agencies were seen in outright conflict. Furthermore, the questions themselves were long and bulky—merely sorting out the answers required a major effort on the part of Kissinger's own staff. And by the time the series of National Security Study Memoranda—on Vietnam and on each of the remaining issues of foreign policy—had been completed, Mr. Nixon and Kissinger had already taken the crucial steps in shaping the new administration's approach to policy.

"They had us tied up here for months and months," one State Department official ruminated recently on the NSSM series. "One wonders whether they've been used in the formulation of foreign policy."

In fact, Kissinger's use of the NSSM series to tie up Washington's civil service was a blunt, cynical attempt to alter the effectiveness of the NSC setup. The options system had been designed to curtail the influence of the bureaucracy, not to remove it; but when the dust had cleared, the Cabinet departments had been rendered virtually ineffective in the choosing of policy. By foreclosing one source of ideas, Kissinger had eliminated the options that would derive from it. The result was that his own office had been measurably strengthened.

As if this were not enough, Kissinger also proceeded to strike the "immediate withdrawal" alternative from the options half of the Vietnam memorandum, leaving his current Vietnamization plan as the most moderate of all the options listed. Thus, even before the paper had gone to the NSC, Kissinger had made the crux of the administration's final choice inevitable: the United States was not going to leave Vietnam without exacting a price from the NLF and Hanoi. By thus manipulating the options system, Kissinger had unilaterally made a crucial policy choice.

Kissinger's ascendancy took an additional toll on the functioning of the Cabinet departments and stifled any useful ideas which might otherwise have originated in them. Neither Rogers nor Defense Secretary Melvin Laird has been as forceful and persuasive an advocate as Kissinger, and, as a result, their immediate assistants—the men who feed position papers to Kissinger and his staff—have been less likely to take risks and back up their department heads. The result has been a near monotony of viewpoint; the crucial policy recommendations have come almost uniformly from Kissinger's office.

More important, however, is the fact that, with the concentration of power in Kissinger's office, congressional investigation of policymaking—which was never very comprehensive—has reached a new low in effectiveness. As confidential adviser to the President, Kissinger has successfully claimed "executive privilege" when asked to testify on the record in congressional hearings. As a result, the only contact that Kissinger has with Congress is through informal, intermittent briefing sessions with House and Senate leaders. And even those briefings appear to be empty exercises, for Kissinger is subjected to them only when the President decides they are necessary.

Congressional resentment on this point reached a high pitch last March, when Stuart Symington, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, charged on the Senate

floor that Kissinger was "Secretary of State in everything but title," and that Rogers' appearances before congressional committees has become "a rather empty exercise."

#### A CONFIDENTIAL RELATIONSHIP

Congress is not the only group of men with whom Kissinger has been secretive. In his spiraling staff of more than 100 people, there is no one with whom Kissinger discusses his conversations with the President. Besides his deputy, Gen. Alexander Haig, there is not one Kissinger staff member who has had any direct access to Mr. Nixon—a sharp departure from past practice, when numerous White House consultants, including Kissinger himself, were able to meet with the President. And until recently, Kissinger was the only administration official besides Mr. Nixon to convey presidential policy to the media.

There is not a single important international issue on which he does not have a major say; even on the subject of the Middle East—which Kissinger generally leaves to the State Department, partly because of his Jewish background—he has emerged at crucial points to warn against a growing Soviet presence. One of Kissinger's former staff assistants recently went so far as to suggest that the Middle East had been tossed to Rogers as a political bone because it was not a major issue.

But if Henry Kissinger's experience as White House administrator has demonstrated anything, it is that obedience to the orderly process of government is basically incompatible with the role of the cunning diplomat. For if he were obligated to predicate his actions upon such obstacles as popular will and honest information, then his actions could be predicted and the diplomat's flexibility—his capacity to pursue a policy of threat—would rapidly diminish. If the bureaucracy could be curbed, and Congress circumvented, then the policy of threat would become a reality. And that is precisely what Kissinger engineered.

[From the Herald of Freedom, Jan. 24, 1969]

#### HENRY R. KISSINGER

It is becoming distressingly apparent to even his staunch supporters that President Richard Nixon has made some strange appointments to key positions. Even before he officially took office, Henry Kissinger, who will be Mr. Nixon's most important adviser on foreign policy, caused the pro-Nixon Manchester Union Leader to editorially demand that Mr. Nixon "Fire Kissinger!" Kissinger is the personification of all that American conservatives distrust and fear in a political leader. He has been associated with the Council on Foreign Relations, the Bilderbergers and the Pugwash Conferences. All three are highly suspect organizations whose activities are carried on in varying degrees of secrecy. Dr. Kissinger continues the McGeorge Bundy, Walt W. Rostow pattern of individuals with CIA connections occupying the top National Security spot. There is no reason to believe the United States will be any better off with Kissinger doing the planning than it was with Rostow with whom most knowledgeable Americans were most unhappy.

McGeorge Bundy, Kennedy's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, was a former CIA man and an associate of Kissinger at Harvard. Walt W. Rostow, who took Bundy's place under Johnson, came from the CIA-financed M.I.T. Center for International Studies. Henry Kissinger has been associated with the International Seminar and the Center for International Affairs at Harvard, also CIA-financed.

Henry Alfred Kissinger was born in Fuerth, Germany, May 27, 1923, the son of Louis Kissinger and the former Paula Stern. He and his brother, Walter Bernhardt Kissinger, were brought to the United States in 1938

by their parents who were refugees from the Hitler regime. Louis Kissinger, Henry's father, was reportedly a prominent rabbi and Zionist in Berlin.

Henry Kissinger graduated from George Washington High School (N.Y.C.) in 1941 and served in the U.S. Armed Forces from 1943 to 1946, being discharged with the rank of staff sergeant. He served with the 970th Counter-Intelligence Corps and remained in the Military Intelligence Reserve. While in service, he was reportedly investigated by G-2 which opened a case because of Kissinger's reported attempts to reach Germany and contact important personages there. Upon leaving military service, he entered Harvard where he majored in government and received four scholarships, among them the Rockefeller Foundation Fellowship for Political Theory. Kissinger graduated from Harvard in 1950 and received his M.A. degree in 1952 and Ph.D. in 1954 in the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Kissinger was married on Feb. 6, 1949 to Miss Ann Fleischer and they were divorced in 1964. The couple has two children.

In 1951 Kissinger had become executive director of the Foreign Student Project which had been started that year by Harvard Summer School. In 1952 its title was changed to International Seminar and it began publishing a quarterly journal entitled, "Confluence, An International Forum," of which Kissinger was the editor from its inception. In 1953, when the Council on Foreign Relations launched a project allegedly to "seek the answer to the question of the threat of Soviet action against insufficient American initiatives," three subcommittees were appointed and Kissinger was named study director. Out of this emerged Kissinger's book, "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," published in 1957 by Harper and Brothers. The book created quite a furor and impressed the then Vice President Nixon. According to the N.Y. TIMES, the book "brought Mr. Kissinger to the attention of scores of politicians, diplomats and military men and became a source book for American policymakers."

Kissinger began his association with the Rockefellers in 1956 when he worked for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc. as director of the over-all Special Studies Project (1956-7) "to develop concepts that might be helpful in meeting the challenges America faces today." From 1958 to 1959 he was Research Secretary of a Council on Foreign Relations discussion group.

Under the Kennedy Administration Kissinger was special consultant to President Kennedy on the Berlin Crisis. He has also been consultant to the Operations Research Office; Operations Coordinating Board, Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, Psychological Strategy Board, National Security Council; and Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. In 1962 he became a full Professor at Harvard, on the faculty of the Center for International Affairs which is CIA-financed. For ten years Kissinger has been chief foreign policy adviser to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, who reportedly "recommended him enthusiastically" to Mr. Nixon. Kissinger was definitely a Rockefeller man, having attended both the 1964 and the 1968 Republican conventions as a Rockefeller aide, hoping his man would get the presidential nomination. He is credited with having pushed the Republican platform toward a more "dovish" position on Vietnam.

The importance of the position now held by Dr. Kissinger was described in an article in the N.Y. TIMES of December 8, 1968:

"For reasons that are as good and logical as they are unsettling, the power of war and peace in the United States resides in the person of one man. Last month, the country elected Richard M. Nixon for the job. Last week, the President-elect chose the one man who day in and day out will guide and guard him in that task: Henry Alfred Kissinger.

"Dr. Kissinger is to be that someone, as McGeorge Bundy was for President Kennedy and Walt W. Rostow has been for President Johnson.

"That all these men should have come from Cambridge is not entirely coincidental. Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology there helped to propel such policy-oriented academicians onto the national scene where the politicians came to know and need them.

Dr. Kissinger's access and accessibility to the academic community must have been an important consideration in his selection, as also was his ten-year advisory relationship with Mr. Nixon's principal rival, Governor Rockefeller of New York. He helped to lead scholars and thus government toward an understanding of the political and psychological problems posed by nuclear technology and toward a re-examination of both diplomatic and military assumptions carried forward from the age of American invulnerability."

Kissinger was a member of a group at Harvard which began working fifteen months before the presidential elections on a study for the benefit of the new president, whoever he might be. Kissinger wrote the foreign policy section of the resulting recommendations and Mr. Nixon was reportedly so impressed with it that he immediately asked Kissinger to see him. (The report will not be made public.) Kissinger wrote the concluding essay in the massive Brookings Institution study, "Agenda for the Nation." The central theme of the essay was that the incoming administration of the United States must deal with a world which is militarily "bi-polarized" but politically "multipolarized."

Kissinger has written many books and articles and it should be easy to find out where he stands from them, but his writings are difficult to understand, often contradictory. A remark attributed to him recently might explain his attitude. A story in Newsweek of December 30, 1968 concerning an article on Vietnam, written by Kissinger before he was named to be Assistant for National Security Affairs by Mr. Nixon, stated: "It was perhaps significant . . . that after his appointment as a Nixon adviser, Kissinger tried first to persuade the editorial board of Foreign Affairs to drop the article and then, no more successfully, to make some changes in the manuscript." The article stated further that when a reporter congratulated him on the "brilliance" of the article, Kissinger replied: "The last thing in the world I want to be at this point is publicly brilliant."

Kissinger's views on ending the war in Vietnam appeared in the January 1969 issue of Foreign Affairs, the quarterly publication of the Council on Foreign Relations. U.S. News and World Report commented on his "formula:"

"The Kissinger formula calls for a series of steps to bring about a phased withdrawal of U.S. and North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam and lay the groundwork for a political settlement between the Saigon Government and the Communist-controlled National Liberation Front. Dr. Kissinger did not rule out but called 'undesirable' suggestions that a coalition government with Communist participation be set up to govern South Vietnam." (Emphasis Added.)

Newsweek in its article on the Kissinger "formula" commented:

"Like most scenarios for a negotiated settlement, Kissinger's article contained some apparent inconsistencies. Although he stressed that Saigon cannot afford to give even implied recognition to the NLF, his proposal for direct talks between the two adversaries could only—despite his disclaimers—give the Viet Cong added stature. . . . And in view of his suggestion that Washington and Saigon maintain the closest possible cooperation, it seemed unrealistic to urge the exclusion of the South Vietnamese from U.S.

talks with Hanoi. Nixon himself declared through a spokesman . . . that he would neither endorse nor condemn Kissinger's article . . ."

Human Events gave the South Vietnamese reaction to the article:

"... the South Vietnamese were also known to be perturbed by an article in Foreign Affairs this month by Henry Kissinger, the man who will be Nixon's chief White House adviser on foreign policy.

"While the Kissinger article is complex and warns against imposing any coalition government on Saigon, many diplomatic observers believe his recommendations for ending the war are extremely fuzzy and could be easily manipulated by Hanoi.

"Particularly irksome to some were his proposals for South Viet Nam to deal directly with the National Liberation Front—thus giving the NLF recognition—and to have a coalition commission supervise the political process in the south, including new elections."

It was because of his recommendations on Vietnam that William Loeb, Publisher of the Manchester Union Leader, stated in an editorial: "The first miserable decision by Professor Kissinger should bring about his dismissal from a post to which he should never have been appointed," Mr. Loeb stated:

"There is one man in the Nixon administration who is acting just as this newspaper predicted. Harvard Professor Henry A. Kissinger, Nixon's ill-chosen White House foreign policy adviser, wants to withdraw the troops. He says it will be a signal to Hanoi that the U.S. is ready to begin general withdrawal of U.S. forces if there is reduced fighting.

"This is typical of the Harvard professor type of unrealistic approach that has done so much harm to this nation in the last 30 years. Kissinger doesn't understand that Hanoi, like its Soviet masters, respects only one thing and that is superior force."

Dr. Kissinger's previous posture on Vietnam was described in the N.Y. Times:

"During the Vietnam war he began, at least publicly, as a defender of American objectives and tactics. But on a series of quiet but energetic government missions, he reached the conclusion much sooner than either Governor Rockefeller or Mr. Nixon that American military prospects were dim, and that Washington's political prescriptions were not working as advertised—he found much fault also with Kennedy and Johnson positions, and especially the running hot-and-cold reactions to Moscow without the planning and strategic purpose that Dr. Kissinger has consistently demanded."

U.S. News and World Report quoted Kissinger as stating: "Ending the war (in Viet Nam) honorably is essential for the peace of the world. Any other solution may unloose forces that would complicate prospects of international order." And this is what Kissinger and his intellectual colleagues definitely want: international order, which would consist of world government in a "World of Disarmament." Kissinger recommended a start toward this in "The Troubled Partnership" in 1965 in which he found a need for improved consultation among the allies. He advocated a "united Europe with federal, supranational institutions as the precondition for an Atlantic partnership," or regional world government.

As the N.Y. Times stated, Dr. Kissinger has access to the academic community, both at home and abroad. He participated in at least one Pugwash Conference, being listed as a participant in Part Two of the two part conference held at Smugglers Notch, Stowe, Vt., Sept. 5 to 8, and Sept. 10 to 17, 1961. This was one of a series of meetings which began in 1957 under the auspices of the very pro-Soviet Cyrus Eaton and which derived their name from his home in Nova Scotia at

which the first meeting was held. The name was changed from "Pugwash," however to improve the image of the conferences and an attempt made to disassociate the conferences from Eaton, at least in the eyes of the public.

The Conference attended by Kissinger was the Seventh Conference on Science and World Affairs, part two being on "Disarmament and Arms Control." Among those participating in the conference were Linus Pauling, Paul Doty, Gerald Piel, I. I. Rabi, Louis Sohn, Henry Kissinger and Leo Szilard. At the Sixth Conference, entitled the Conference of International Scientists on World Security and Disarmament, held in Moscow, Nov. 27 to Dec. 5, 1960, Kissinger's predecessor in his present job was present. Walt W. Rostow gave the closing address. Also in attendance at the Moscow conference was Dr. Jerome Wiesner, an important adviser to President Kennedy as was Rostow. The thinking of Rostow, Wiesner and Kissinger seems to be that we must trust the Soviets in order to avoid annihilation in this thermonuclear age.

The general plan is for the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to join forces to police the world under a supranational authority such as an enlarged and greatly strengthened U.N., armed with a nuclear police force. Some of the papers presented at the Moscow Pugwash Conference in 1960 were most frightening in their content but they were not meant for the eyes and ears of the masses, just for those who are planning our future.

It is interesting to note that in January 1967, Nelson Rockefeller (to whom Kissinger was foreign policy adviser for ten years) and Cyrus Eaton, Jr., son of the sponsor of the Pugwash conferences, joined forces to profit by trading with the Communists. International Basic Economy Corp., controlled by the Rockefeller brothers and organized in 1947 under the principal direction of Nelson Rockefeller, and Tower International, Inc., headed by Cyrus Eaton, Jr., announced plans, as revealed in the N.Y. Times of January 16, 1967, to "spur trade with Reds." The article stated: "An alliance of family banking fortunes linking Wall Street and the Midwest is going to try to build economic bridges between the Free World and Communist Europe. The joint effort contemplated by I.B.E. and Tower is seen as combining the investment skills and resources of the Rockefellers and the special entre to Soviet bloc officialdom that Tower enjoys largely as a result of contacts cultivated over the last 15 years by Cyrus S. Eaton, Sr. The elder Eaton has been an outspoken advocate of closer ties between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. He has backed his convictions by visiting Russia and entertaining high Soviet leaders including former Premier Khrushchev." Kissinger's "foreign policy" advice must have made Rockefeller feel that investments in Communist countries would not be too risky.

Men of science are not going to have complete control of the new "World of Disarmament," as there are other important people in the world . . . bankers, industrialists, diplomats. These people meet and plan in secret and are called the Bilderbergers. Henry Kissinger has attended at least one of their meetings. His name was on the list of participants at the Williamsburg, Va. Conference, which took place March 20, 21 and 22, 1964. The idea of the Bilderberg meetings originated in the early fifties. The first meeting that brought American and European "leading citizens" together took place under the chairmanship of Prince Bernhard at the Bilderberg Hotel in Oosterbeek, Holland, from May 29 to May 31, 1954. Although the Bilderbergers claim that they are not a "policy-making body" and that "no conclusions are reached," they surely do not bring important people from practically the four corners of the earth for nothing.

Another group of "unofficial" policymakers is the Council on Foreign Relations, with which Kissinger has long been affiliated. The CFR is believed by many to be the secret government of the United States. After a thorough investigation this organization was declared subversive by the American Legion of California in 1962.

Among the present or past members of the Council on Foreign Relations we find the following:

Alger Hiss, Ralph Bunche, Lauchlin Currie, Harry Dexter White, Herbert Matthews, Joseph Barnes, Cyrus Eaton, J. Robert Oppenheimer, John K. Fairbank and Arthur Goldberg, all of whom have had a record of close affiliation with Communists and some of whom were actually identified as Communists.

During the first week of December 1968 the International Association for Cultural Freedom conducted a five-day closed seminar at Princeton, N.J. Ninety individuals attended, among them Henry Kissinger who told those assembled "The doors to the White House will always be open to your ideas." Present to hear this kind invitation were Charles Hamilton, co-author with Stokely Carmichael of the book, "Black Power"; Andreas Papan-dreou, left-wing leader of the Panhellenic Liberation Movement, exiled from Greece due to his pro-Communist activities; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., McGeorge Bundy and George Ball, among others. Some of the participants were from Communist countries at this seminar financed by the Ford Foundation.

Henry Kissinger has been a friend and associate of John Kenneth Galbraith (who called the appointment of his friend "a good one"), Adam Yarmolinsky (expected to step into Kissinger's job at Harvard, who said "I will sleep better with Henry Kissinger in Washington."), Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. ("I think it is an excellent appointment.") and Robert R. Bowie with whom he worked at the Harvard Center for International Affairs.

Kissinger has been described by a colleague as "impatiently arrogant" and his confidence in his own ability is evident from a comment reportedly made when Rockefeller sent one of his "position papers" to other advisers for comment: "Do you ask a housepainter to touch up a Picasso?" In his new position Dr. Kissinger intends to make some long-range plans for the United States as well as to completely reorganize and restructure the entire White House security planning machinery. This is a very important job to entrust to a man as acceptable to the Democratic left-wing Kennedy Administration as he seemingly is to the Republican moderate Nixon Administration. To what ends will he use the "brilliance" he wishes to conceal from the American people?

**MONSIGNOR FRANK SAMMONS:  
CONCERNED PRIEST, RESPONSIBLE  
LEADER, AND FRIEND**

### HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to relate to the Members of the House, a great pleasure I had a few days ago.

I attended a testimonial dinner for Msgr. Frank L. Sammons, former director of the Catholic Youth Organization, and now pastor at St. Patrick's Catholic Church in the city of Syracuse.

I have known Monsignor Sammons for a great many years, having served on the board of the Catholic Youth Organiza-

tion during the period which he was director. He also is a member of the 34th Congressional District Service Academy Selection Board and has provided great assistance to that group in their process of selecting candidates for our service academies.

Many prominent residents of Onondaga County praised Monsignor Sammons during the festivities including the county executive for Onondaga County, John Mulroy; mayor of the city of Syracuse, Lee Alexander, Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Syracuse, the Most Reverend David F. Cunningham, and the Auxiliary Bishop, the Most Reverend Frank J. Harrison.

Bishop Cunningham characterized the work of Monsignor Sammons over the years as reflecting goals of "holiness, health, and happiness."

Monsignor Sammons has provided young people for over two decades with hope, spiritual guidance, and a sense of community concern. His selfless dedication is best reflected in his own remarks after the testimonial dinner. He stated:

This dinner tonight should have been in honor of Monsignor M. Shields Dwyer, the first director of the CYO. His leadership in the early days made the organization bear fruit for many years. Any good I have achieved, has been the result of what others have done to help. We are what our friends make us.

Monsignor Sammons richly deserved the tributes he received this past Sunday night. He is a concerned priest, a responsible community leader, and a friend to all in need since he was ordained. Central New York is a better place, because of Monsignor Sammons' contribution.

### ROONEY AND REASONER UNITE FOR FOUR MORE TV ESSAYS

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a constituent directed my attention to a TV-radio column in the New York Daily News which gives an interesting insight into one instance in which the media did not automatically attack business or independent businessmen.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should emphasize the positive point that the vast majority of individual businessmen and business concerns in our country service the public honestly and quite effectively. The great progress which our country has made has been, in large part, because of our vital free enterprise system, and this often overlooked fact does appear in this particular column:

### ROONEY AND REASONER UNITE FOR FOUR MORE TV ESSAYS

(By Val Adams)

Andrew Rooney, a writer who contributed to Harry Reasoner's reputation as a wit, is back again working with Reasoner. Andy will write and produce four light-hearted essays, the same type of material he did for Reasoner when both worked for CBS, which will be televised by ABC.

Reasoner, who also can write amusing

material on his own, left CBS for ABC in 1970. Last year Rooney, growing restive because of a lack of work, decided to leave CBS and freelance. He has done 16 film pieces for National Educational Television's the Great American Dream Machine, including a three-minute essay on sex that will be televised next Wednesday evening.

Rooney claims not to know how he happened to land at ABC except to say: "They called me." Presumably Reasoner told ABC he'd like to do some half-hour essays and to get Rooney.

### SIX SPECIALS

The first Reasoner-Rooney special for ABC, "A Bird's Eye View of California," will be presented March 13. It was filmed from a helicopter. There will be six specials in the series, but two will be produced by Jules Power.

Any time Rooney does a piece for TV and it isn't used for one reason or another, he broods. At CBS he prepared an essay on war, which Reasoner was to narrate, but Reasoner left before the program was completed. Then 60 Minutes proposed to use the piece, but in a shorter form, and Rooney would not agree. With CBS permission, he brought the film with him when he left the network and eventually sold it to NET.

### LEFT IT BEHIND

Right now Rooney is brooding again. In moving to ABC, he left behind at NET a 15-minute film he wrote and produced, but which the Great American Dream Machine has decided not to use. Andy isn't sure why. But the idea of what he started out to do in the film, only to learn it couldn't be done, is an amusing story in itself.

Rooney has a talent for taking the trivial and the commonplace and probing them from a whimsical point of view. There were, for instance, the essays on doors, bridges and chairs. As a piece for the Great American Dream Machine, he got the idea of checking on whether gasoline stations give full measure to customers or shortchange them.

### POSSIBLE EXPOSÉ

It could be quite an exposé. Rooney thought. How can any motorist know whether gauges on gasoline pumps are accurate or whether advertised high octane is what actually goes into his tank?

Using film crews from public TV stations around the country, Rooney checked on 86 gas stations in 30 states—in each case ordering five gallons of gas pumped into a calibrated can. A petroleum testing laboratory was hired to test samples for octane ratings.

Much to his dismay, Rooney soon learned he had a non-expose on his hands. In most cases, the gas stations gave full measure—even more than, in a few instances—and the octane ratings checked out.

### SPECIAL TOUCHES

But Rooney refused to junk his production and sought to salvage it with special touches in the script here and there. One line read: "Unlike the hard-hitting investigative report that turns up all kinds of cheating, we found almost none." Appearing on camera at the sign off, Rooney said: "When you drive up to a gas station and ask for 10 gallons of high-octane gas, that's what you get. Sorry about that."

Rooney, 52, who has three daughters and a son, lives in Rowayton, Conn. He hasn't lacked for work since he sold movie rights to his book, "The Story of Stars and Stripes," to MGM for \$55,000 soon after World War II. Andy was on the staff of Stars and Stripes during the war.

### WROTE FOR CALENDAR

He has written material for Arthur Godfrey, Garry Moore, Victor Borge, Sam Levenson, Bob and Ray and the late Herb Shriner. He first became associated with Reasoner when Rooney was a writer for Calendar, a

former daytime series on CBS-TV with Reasner and Mary Pickett as hosts.

"I'm a writer," Rooney said. "I produce from necessity. Producing is a minor art."

Although Rooney does appear on camera at times, he does not relish the role. "I have no interest in being a performer," he said. Also known in TV as a time filler, Rooney used to sit with Walter Cronkite in a broadcasting booth during political conventions, aiding Walter with material to fill time. "I know how to fill time on TV in an interesting and amusing way," he said, "but I hate to think of myself as a time filler."

## THE HALF WHO MADE IT

### HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, each day Members of Congress place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD speeches, letters, and published writings that reflect not only the sentiments of constituents and organizations but also—and especially when netted together—the mental processes and spirit of the national body. It is said the RECORD remains close to representing fully the continuing flow of American thought. Often, it is our privilege to inject into this mainstream a speech that has so much heartfelt quality and insight that readers find themselves pausing for a moment as we do after reading not an embroidered or baroque poem but a lean and finely chiseled one that matched or recalled something we had always known but could not properly state, or as we pause after reading a hard-hitting but humanely journalistic account completely devoid of frills.

I have the honor today of requesting that a speech given to the Yale alumni class of 1921 by former Connecticut Senator, Bill Benton, be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Now a publisher and chairman of the Encyclopedia Britannica, Senator Benton delivered to his friends and classmates at their 50th alumni reunion a speech filled with golden philosophical nuggets. References to Oliver Wendell Holmes, the Bible, Satchell Paige, Willy Mays, W. C. Fields, Gypsy Rose Lee, and John Churchill, the first Duke of Marlborough, give evidence of the Senator's broad reach across the affairs of life. While the subject of the speech seems to be "old age," it is really more. The speech is a penetrating ray into the meaning of each stage of awareness as we move from "our classes of 21" to that 50th reunion which comes too soon.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include William Benton's speech entitled "The Half Who Made It," in the RECORD:

#### THE HALF WHO MADE IT

Well, we who are here are those who have made it.

We are the half who made it. The Yale Class of 1921 started its Freshman year in 1917 with an enrollment of 326. We were the war babies, most of us too young to get into the Army. 160 or 48 percent are now alive. Yes, we are the lucky one-half.

As we look back, class prophecies have not been very reliable and the conclusion to be drawn is that of the preacher in the Bible,

that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favor to men of skill, but that time and chance happen to us all.

Let us emulate Oliver Wendell Holmes Senior who about a century ago, on a somewhat similar occasion, said "Old Time is a liar! We are twenty tonight." Last year Pancho Gonzales was asked how he felt playing with a partner who was under twenty. He replied, "We're exactly the same age; I've just been there longer."

So let us not look back nostalgically to the days when we voted Walter Schleiter the most versatile by two to one over Harry Mall. Perhaps the only one in our class who lived up to our prophecies and our hopes for him is Bob Hutchins who beat Skip Jencks two to one as "the most likely to succeed" and who stood second as "most to be admired" and "most brilliant." (For the last, I got two votes, mine and one anonymous, could it have been Hutchins?)

So here we, the fortunate, are. We are like the French aristocrat who was asked in the days of Louis Philippe what he did during the French Revolution. He replied, "I survived." Let us tonight also be like Satchell Paige who pitched a winning ball game when he was close to our age and then warned, "Don't look back; something might be gaining on you."

When Bob Lewis asked me to speak tonight, I said, "What do you want me to speak about?" He replied "About fifteen minutes." Then Bob hesitated, "But don't say anything about Yale!—it's too controversial!"

Well, I'm controversial too. I never seem to agree with anybody, including myself.

But seemingly I'm not as controversial as Kingman Brewster. Last week he told the Yale undergraduates that our college campuses are enveloped by an "eerie tranquility," whatever the hell that means.

I console myself with my advice to the executives of the two companies of which I am chairman, "Go ahead and make mistakes; if you don't make mistakes you'll never make anything." If I were to make a speech to the Harvard Business School, I would entitle it, "Now I See My Mistakes."

Now if Yale is too controversial—and I think you will perhaps thank me for sparing you the fifteen pages sent by the News Bureau entitled "the accomplishments and reputation of President Kingman Brewster, Jr. at Yale"—though I for one am prepared to stand here and pay tribute to his leadership in times of great difficulty and stress—but if Yale is too controversial, what then? What else do we have in common? The somewhat jolly realization that we have all attained the Biblical cycle of three score and ten. There's nothing controversial about being over seventy. There are three things said about men like us in that age group: One, that our memory plays trick upon us; I forget the other two.

Perhaps we've gained a little virtue. There was the senior citizen who raised his hand in affirmation when the preacher, during a sermon on loving one's enemies, asked if anyone in the congregation did not have any enemies. The minister then asked how the man accounted for that. The senior citizen replied, "I've outlived the bastards."

And perhaps we've gained a little wisdom. We probably agree with the line in Joe E. Lewis' obituary a couple of weeks ago, "Rich or poor, it's better to have money." Or with his even more famous line, "What's money, as long as you have plenty of it?"

Of course, the most important thing in the world is not money but love. Some of our classmates may be among the lucky people. They may love money. Look what love did for Professor Erich Segal!

Maybe we even concede the wisdom of the oldster who was asked how he developed such

good judgment. "From experience," he replied. But when pressed, he added sadly, "Yet I'm a little confused; most of my experience has come from bad judgment." Or have we been lucky enough to have learned something about how to seduce a girl? My friend Beardsley Ruml, the great psychologist, told me that at age sixty he had learned the secret. He said it was too devastating to impart. Should he tell it to me? Shall I tell it to you? He could put it into one word. That word was "listen!" Aren't we all old enough to have learned how never to take "yes" for an answer?

Not long ago the wife of a university chancellor asked me how I felt with my hepatitis. I told her I felt amorous; I felt like Marilyn Monroe for dinner. The chancellor's wife was the kind of woman who produces that kind of answer. Then I added, "But I don't feel like chasing her around the block." She retorted, "Oh, you mean Raquel Welch." "Who's she?" I inquired. She closed out the conversation, "You show your age!"

We are lucky if we can echo the words of Gypsy Rose Lee. In her fifties, when asked how she felt, she replied, "Just fine, couldn't feel better." "Ah, but Miss Lee," pressed her questioner, "How do you feel in contrast to the way you used to feel?" Gypsy, a woman of the world with a sense of humor—and a million dollars—shot back, "As I used to feel? Everything is just the same. Yes, it's just the same—except it's a little bit lower." At about our time of life, one's narrow waist and broad mind have completed their change of places.

Bob Hutchins is one guy in the class to whom the Gypsy story doesn't apply. He still has the waistline of Gypsy youth. Can this be because he never takes any exercise? Do you remember his crack? "Whenever the desire to exercise comes over me, I lie down until it passes over." Did Bob remember the question addressed to him by Yale's famous legal scholar, Walton Hamilton, when Bob became President of the University of Chicago? Professor Hamilton wanted to know, "Do university presidents lose their integrity all at once or is it a gradual process?" Bob's modern counterpart is Willy Mays, the 40-year-old baseball miracle, who never stands when he can sit and never sits when he can lie down. I suspect more of us are like the man who went to the doctor and told him he felt lousy. The doctor examined him and told him he couldn't find anything the matter with him. Next week the patient was back, "Doc, I still feel lousy." Then came the barium enema and the rest. Still the doctor could find nothing wrong. The third week the man was back again, still feeling lousy. "How old are you?" asked the doctor. "I'm seventy," replied the patient. "Oh, go on home," said the doctor, "you'll never feel all right again!" I fear the man was like the fifth husband of Zsa Zsa Gabor. He commented wryly, "I know what's expected of me but I don't know how to make it interesting."

Do my Yale classmates still remember at seventy W. C. Fields' advice to the fifth husband, "There may be something better and there may be things that are worse, but there's nothing exactly like it!"?

Of course one way to prevent old age is frequent naps—if taken when driving.

Well, none of us is as good as we used to be, and in truth we never were. When I reminisce I ask you please not to check up on me. As is the privilege of a man over seventy, the things I remember best never happened at all.

At least we shall try to get through this reunion without flaunting any sign of decay except garrulousness.

When the normal lethargy of age has had its way with us, and with our dwindling resolution, we shall in our new found leisure be doing less and less of the more and more we had promised ourselves to do. We shall not do much which we have not been doing, and

we shall do less and less of what we have been doing.

At our sexennial reunion Bob Hutchins told us he had been elected Secretary of Yale because the rumor had gotten around that President Angel wanted to make Yale an educational institution. This greatly upset the alumni. Bob was hired to hit the hustings to make speeches to placate them.

The alumni still need placating, our class along with the rest. John Churchill, the first Duke of Marlborough, was said to have "a firm grasp of the obvious." Perhaps our experiences at this reunion will help achieve this for some of us about the problems facing this great university. Our dinner seems not the place to discuss them—at least our Alumni Chairman thinks so. But as a trustee of six colleges and universities, I can report to you that their problems are mounting and no problems are more significant to the future of the country.

May I not assume your interest in our colleges and universities by your presence here tonight? I commend their problems to your pocketbooks and, more remotely I hope, to your estates.

I conclude with a quote from Longfellow, a poet who was not taught to us by Billy Phelps, Johnny Berdan or Chauncey Tinker:

"Age is opportunity no less  
Then youth itself, though in another dress.  
And as the evening twilight fades away  
The sky is filled with stars invisible by day."

Yes, in the early morning of Yale youth, or at high noon, it is impossible to see the stars.

God have mercy on us all, my classmates here and in absentia.

#### THE PROTECTORS IN MODERN HEALTH CARE—SPEECH BY DR. FREDERIC J. KOTTKE

### HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, Dr. Frederic J. Kottke, head of the Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of Minnesota, spoke at the inauguration of a new rehabilitation facility of the Alexian Brothers in Chicago. What he said there about the lack of rehabilitation services in the United States deserves the serious attention of all people who are concerned with health care in our country. I am pleased to include at this point Dr. Kottke's remarks:

#### THE PROTECTORS IN MODERN HEALTH CARE

The history of the Alexian Brothers as protectors of the sick is similar to the story of the Good Samaritan. He was not an individual of any particular importance or station in life. We really know nothing about him. His undying fame arises from the fact that he came upon a stranger in need, a man who had been beaten and robbed and left to die, and the Samaritan took care of this injured man and arranged to nurse him back to health. The Good Samaritan was a man who went far out of his way to protect and care for a stranger who was sick and in need.

I am impressed that the origin and history of the Alexian Brothers has been similar to the role of the Samaritan. It is an amazing example of Christian brotherhood. The Alexian Brothers, in the 14th Century, at considerable hazard to themselves, cared for victims of the Black Death. Then, as now, they dedicated their lives to help the sick,

the poor and the needy. Their work in the United States for the past 100 years is most impressive. They have operated hospitals, trained nurses, established retirement homes and provided services where there is a need. Now they are moving ahead to establish a Department of Rehabilitation Medicine in their Medical Center to respond to one of the most important unmet needs of health care today.

The Alexian Brothers Medical Center is not only expanding their comprehensive medical care by adding a Department of Rehabilitation Medicine but they are moving into a position of leadership in the field of health services by selecting one of the most able physiatrists to head this program. Dr. Edward Gordon is a physiatrist for whom I have the highest regard. We have been friends and colleagues for 25 years. We first became acquainted when he was a Baruch Fellow in Physical Medicine at Columbia University-Presbyterian Hospital, New York, and I was a Baruch Fellow at the University of Minnesota. Since we both have had a research interest in the physiologic effects of activity and exercise as well as our clinical interest in the rehabilitation of patients, we have maintained a close professional relationship over these years. Dr. Gordon is a specialist in Internal Medicine as well as in Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. His studies of the energy required by rehabilitation activities are outstanding. He is widely known for his research on paraplegia, stroke, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis and myocardial infarction. When the National Stroke Congress was held in Chicago in 1964 Dr. Gordon was selected to present a model program for the rehabilitation management of stroke. He is highly regarded as a teacher and a leader in Rehabilitation Medicine. He has been on the Board of Governors of the American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation and on the Editorial Board of the Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. The American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine recognized his outstanding contributions by awarding him the Gold Key for Distinguished Service in 1968. In Dr. Gordon as the head of your rehabilitation program, therefore, you have the leadership and the potential to make this one of the great rehabilitation programs of the United States.

It may be that the greatest deficiency in health care in the United States today is the lack of rehabilitation services for patients with physical disabilities or chronic diseases. There are a number of reasons for this. There are so many disabled persons—probably 5 million. The work of rehabilitation is slow and drudging and not rewarded by sudden and dramatic cures. As a matter of fact, most patients, although significantly more independent and self sufficient after rehabilitation than before, still have some residual limitations which persist. Therefore, these patients continue to present some problems and often need some continuing help. For many of these patients such as strokes, arthritics, paraplegics or other accidents, burns, muscular dystrophy or multiple sclerosis a great deal of rehabilitation is necessary to restore them from complete dependence. It requires a special kind of person and a special attitude to be willing to invest so much for such a slow return. For that reason it has been much harder to interest public organizations and the health professions in establishing rehabilitation facilities than it has been to interest them in acute hospitals. That, however, is looking at the dark side of the picture.

If we look at the positive aspect of rehabilitation the opportunities to help these disabled patients are tremendous. Let us consider as an example of rehabilitation one of the commonest illnesses which we see today, the patient with a stroke. Stroke to most of us signifies inability to walk, dress, eat, care for toileting; and often, inability to talk. It all too often connotes complete

disability and bedfast care in a nursing home through the remaining life of the patient. With rehabilitation that prospect is far different. The chance for restoration to independence in self-care and usefulness is extremely high.

Stroke appears to be one of our most common disabling diseases. If we consider all ages, 2 persons per 1,000 population per year have their first stroke. If we look at the population over age 65 we find that the annual incidence of first stroke increases to 1 percent. Five persons per 1,000 living in our communities have had a stroke. Twenty percent of these patients have recovered without disability and may have needed no rehabilitation. The critical question is what has happened to the other 80 percent who still have some or much disability.

There are no controlled studies so we must compare reports of groups of patients who have received rehabilitation against other groups of patients who have not had a rehabilitation program. A long-term study of more than 650 stroke patients at the Mayo Clinic found that 75 percent of strokes are due to cerebral thrombosis, or clotting of blood in one of the cerebral arteries. Eighty percent of these patients survive from this stroke. Of patients who live more than 1 month after their first stroke the average life expectancy is 5 years, and in half of these persons death is caused by something other than a cerebrovascular accident. Three other studies give similar results.

Any patient who has residual physical disability a month after a stroke should have rehabilitation. As a matter of fact, rehabilitation maintenance should begin as soon as the patient is seen, and rehabilitation activities should be started as soon as the patient is able to respond. In round numbers, recovery from the acute effects of a stroke requires about 1 month of hospital care, and another month for rehabilitation is required in order to achieve independence in self-care and ambulation. Three hospitals which offered such rehabilitation for their stroke patients—Mayo Clinic, Milwaukee General, and New York Hospital—found that only 3-4% of their patients remained completely dependent. On the other hand, in Licking County Hospital, when stroke patients received acute nursing care and activity but were discharged at the end of 1 month, 38% of those patients still were completely dependent at the time of discharge. In Glasgow, Scotland, among stroke patients who received acute hospital care but not rehabilitation 18% remained completely dependent in a follow-up study and another 18% remained partially dependent. In other words, these studies indicate that without that additional month of rehabilitation from 20 to 35 percent more patients remain completely dependent after stroke. Another 30 percent of patients benefit from rehabilitation by becoming more independent. For the 5-10 years that patients live after strokes their lives may be confined and miserable without rehabilitation, or active, enjoyable and productive with rehabilitation.

Now let us turn from the humanitarian consideration of whether or not life is worth living after a stroke and look at the financial aspect of the cost of care of stroke victims with and without rehabilitation.

Today in Minneapolis hospitalization costs about \$100 per day. Rehabilitation costs the same \$100 per day. The cost to the patient of that additional month for rehabilitation to become independent in self-care and ambulation is \$3,000. That is a terrific price to pay for rehabilitation, isn't it? What is the cost of not receiving rehabilitation? In calculating this cost we must recognize that this is the cost of dependency over the 4, 5, or 10 years that the patient will survive.

Again, I know the financial data best for

Minneapolis. Nursing home care for a completely dependent stroke patient who must be fed, toileted, dressed, assisted in transfers, and cared for in bed costs \$154 per week or \$8,000 per year. If he lives 3 years the nursing home alone will cost \$24,000. If he lives 5 years the nursing home cost will be \$40,000 and too many patients after stroke do exist this way. These patients usually cannot be cared for at home.

If we can merely improve the self-care of our stroke patient so that he can feed himself we can obtain nursing home care for him for \$104 per week or \$5,400 per year and in 3 years have saved \$7,800. If he lives 5 we will have saved \$13,000. If he can return to his home he avoids this cost.

If our patient is rehabilitated to feed, toilet, and dress himself and has limited ambulation he can return home or we can find a suitable rest home for him for \$300 per month which is a saving of \$4,400 per year when compared to complete dependency.

If our patient is completely independent in self-care and ambulation he can find a retirement home for \$2,400 per year if he has no home of his own.

The financial statistics are even more compelling than the humanitarian argument in support of rehabilitation. Physical dependency is extremely expensive. Rehabilitation is an excellent investment.

This review of the effects of rehabilitation on the outlook for the patient with stroke shows the kinds of advantages obtained by rehabilitation for any of the severe physical disabilities. The patient and his family receive tremendous benefits. The community benefits. The costs of rehabilitation are less than the costs of allowing the patient to remain dependent. Everybody benefits. However, rehabilitation is complex enough that it requires that some organization assume the responsibility to bring together those people and facilities which are necessary to make rehabilitation function at an optimal level.

I am glad to see that the Alexian Brothers, in accord with their long tradition, are providing this added benefit for the sick. They have extended their services as protectors of the sick into a new area in order to not only add years to life but also to add life to those years.

#### STRIP MINING

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, over the last few years, great increases in coal production have benefited our society. But this increased production has also had an impact on the environment in areas where the coal is mined. Unreclaimed lands which have been strip mined are just one example of environmental abuses which emanate from coal mining operations. Acid mine drainage is another. Even in minute concentrations, the acids can be toxic to fish, wildlife, plants, and aquatic insects. There are still other impacts which result from coal mining but I do not think it is necessary to catalog them here, since we are all too familiar with both their causes and results.

For many years, these and other problems have been widely recognized. Some States have taken action as a result of public complaints, but nationwide responses, for the most part, have been lax.

In 1965, for example, the Department of the Interior estimated that 3.2 million acres of land—or about 5,000 square miles—have been surface mined. How much of this land had been reclaimed? The report's answer is disappointing:

From a survey conducted by the Soil Conservation Service and data submitted by certain States it is concluded that probably only one-third of the total acreage disturbed by surface mining has been adequately reclaimed . . .

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this is a record which none of us should be proud of and that we must take steps immediately to regulate such adverse practices which are permanently destroying our environment.

In the past, coal operators were concerned only with production and they gave little notice to the manner in which they obtained their product. I do not believe the public is willing to accept that philosophy any longer.

We need the kind of legislative effort that will end our present one-sided love affair with strip mining. I wish to submit to the Record, Mr. Speaker, a poem and an open letter composed by Constance Bedson, one of my constituents. Her compositions express both lyrically and accurately the warning to which our country must pay heed, if our mountains are to be saved. The material follows:

#### STRIP MINING

Put a wreath around the Mountain. It is dead. Strip mining.  
And all the debris, left behind, piled high—  
will not make a Mountain.  
We need coal for electricity so that we can have Light to see.  
But we are in the dark—because we can no longer see the Mountain.

DEAR UNITED STATES: Tonight on TV I saw Arthur Fiedler conducting the Boston Pops. I heard the Singers singing "Oklahoma." And a deep feeling of Love for our Country arose in me and I wrote you a letter.

"A bright golden haze on the Meadow." And if we cover all the Meadows with housing developments. With refuse. Who will be able to Sing? To Compose Music like Rodgers and Hammerstein?

And if we level all the Mountains—Strip Mining. What Mountains will the Spirit of Man be able to Climb?

O the Stars are Wondrous in the darkened night. But let us keep the Sweet Green Earth where little Poems are born.

If there is no Beauty left in our Land there will be nothing to Sing about. And a Nation without Music and Song is like a Night without Stars.

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental

genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

#### PHYSICIANS JOIN ANTIABORTION DRIVE

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the question of an unborn child's right to life has long been a major concern of mine, and I have recently been greatly troubled by the growing tide of disrespect for human life in this country. I refer specifically to the pressure that is being put upon legislators to abandon the constitutional principle of the inalienable right to life in favor of liberalized abortion laws.

I was pleased to note that a group of more than 220 physicians has realized the importance of speaking out in favor of the unborn child as a separate and individual human person with undeniable rights. In a 79-page amicus curiae brief, the physicians urged the U.S. Supreme Court to review medical evidence detailing the humanity of an unborn child and thus to regard the child as a human being entitled to protection under the fifth and 14th amendments of the Constitution. The Court has consented to consider the doctors' report.

An article describing the physicians' brief as well as various antiabortion efforts being conducted across the country recently appeared in the Catholic Standard, and I insert the article into the Record at this point:

[From the Catholic Standard, Washington, D.C., Dec. 9, 1971]

AS CAMPAIGN SPREADS: 220 PHYSICIANS JOIN ANTIABORTION DRIVE

(By Louis A. Panarale)

The campaign against liberalized abortion laws has opened up on new fronts at national, statewide and diocesan levels.

The U.S. Supreme Court has agreed to consider medical evidence on abortion from more than 220 physicians across the nation who urge protection of the unborn.

The physicians asked the high court in a 79-page "amicus curiae" or friend-of-the-court brief to recognize the unborn individual as a person entitled to protection under the fifth and fourteenth amendments of the Constitution. They lined up with anti-abortion appellants in Texas and Georgia district courts.

The medical group's position is that "the unborn are developing human persons who need the protection of the law just as do adults."

The physicians, more than 100 of them professors at leading medical schools and the rest private practitioners, said they were motivated to speak on "the pro-life side of abortion."

Many of them are Fellows of the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology. Many were signing their names against abortion for the first time—and their basic argument stemmed from grounds other than religious.

Taking issue with the idea that abortions should be treated no differently than any medical procedure to protect maternal health, completely disregarding the human being developing in the womb, the doctors said that

at fertilization "a new and unique being is created which, although receiving one-half of its chromosomes from each parent, is really unlike either."

They went on to detail how medical science sees the humanity of the unborn child:

Blood cells form at 17 days.

A heart forms as early as 18 days, starts irregular pulsating at 24 days, smooths out into regular contractions at about 30 days.

Development of the nervous system is underway at 18 days.

The brain begins at the 20th day, along with the spinal cord and the entire nervous systems, all of which are completely formed at 30 days.

The eyes begin to form at 19 days, with 40 pairs of muscles begun by 28 days, at which the embryo is 10,000 times larger than fertilized egg and has millions of cells instead of one cell.

At the 30th day, the quarter-inch-long embryo begins to look distinctly human, no longer exchanges blood with the mother—and the mother may not even be aware yet that she is pregnant.

Said the doctors: "Human life is a continuum which commences in the womb. . . . Modern science has proven conclusively that any law based on quickening is based on shifting sands—a subjective standard even different among races. We now know that life precedes quickening."

Meanwhile, the first Abortion Study Committee in Pennsylvania, conducted by Pennsylvanians for Human Life (PHL), issued reports based on research papers it studied in closed sessions at Hershey, Pa.

Thomas A. Noone, Jr., PHL president, said that Pennsylvanians too long have been looking to the Governor's office, the state legislature and the Supreme Court for leadership in population control and abortion.

"Time is running out," Mr. Noone said. "Prenatal life is being destroyed without regard to the rights of the unborn to live. Pregnant women are being asked to risk their lives and health by accepting abortion as a solution to their problems."

In Rhode Island, the Providence Diocese has launched Birthright Counseling, a 24-hour professional counseling service for women "experiencing crises because of unwanted or problem pregnancies."

Birthright Counseling, a nonsectarian program, offers its services through a "hot-line" telephone number.

In a statement on its philosophy and purpose, the counseling service said, it will "attempt to bring women through the initial shock of an unwanted pregnancy."

The purpose of the service "will not be to moralize, or be judgmental, or condemnatory or punitive or to pressure anyone to go against their personal convictions," according to the statement.

"The focus will rather be to offer help, kindness, warmth and understanding, with professional counseling to every woman with a problem pregnancy."

The Syracuse Diocese has announced a campaign "to bring respect for all life out of the political arena and into moral and educational contexts."

Seventy-five speakers have been assigned to address parishes in the upstate New York diocese under the joint coordination of the diocesan family life agency and religious education officials.

Coadjutor Bishop David Cunningham said: "We must make every effort to reach our people in every way possible so that the religious and moral dimensions of this issue will always receive prime consideration in their personal judgments and actions."

## WHY WE GO INTO SPACE

### HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, you have often heard me speak here on the benefits we all derive from the space program and the necessity of an adequate funding level for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

On occasions, when I look at the work NASA is doing with its present budget and dream of all it could do with more, I feel that all the eloquent words in the world would not convince some of my fellow Members that NASA is worth every penny we spend.

Today I have what I consider a breath of fresh air which I feel may catch the attention of some of the doubters. The article I am about to read you was written by a young man in my district who has grown up next door to the space program.

The writer is Jeff Edmonds, who though he is only 15 years old, has captured all the vitality, importance, and spirit of our space program in a moving and articulate bit of advocacy.

Jeff, writing in his high school magazine at La Porte High School in La Porte, Tex., has expressed what I think a majority of Americans feel—space is the new frontier and America can do no less than open new frontiers. I ask you to listen to his wise words:

#### WHY WE GO INTO SPACE

(By Jeff Edmonds)

And they wait. Above the pathetic culture of modern humanity hang the stars. The passage of time affects them not. Their life is eternity, each heartbeat an eon, and each breath countless ages. In one breath of their cosmic existence they watched over a promising humanity. And in the dim light of morning they heard the echo of the excited words, "Land ho."

And upon the return of the explorers there arose a triumphant welcome from those who understood the importance of such a discovery and realized the treasure of a new continent. But there was a shrug of ignorance from the others who could not comprehend the value of new discoveries and new territories.

In the same breath the stars looked down upon the struggles of a primitive humanity, and guided those who would reach out with the first step. "A small step for man, a giant leap for mankind."

And again, amidst praise and applause, there were those who displayed only a strong apathy toward such an appalling event. It is these people today who are so near-sighted, imperceptive, and worldly practical that in every conversation strike up the familiar question, "Why should we go to the moon?" Such a well thought out question deserves an answer as complicated as, "Because it is there."

But actually this statement says quite a simply because it is there. The moon, the lot, for it sums up the reasons for all the great ventures of the past. Though many practical reasons are stated to explain the current space program, the real reason, known by every scientist and dreamer, is planets, the stars, the universe.

But this is usually counterattacked with a variation on the ancient argument: "If the Lord has meant for us to fly he would have given us wings." To answer this and remain on the previous subject one need only to say, "He did." For as God created life in great diversity, he blessed man with intelligence, reasoning, and most of all, curiosity. For without curiosity, man's intelligence would serve no purpose. This inherent trait allowed man to gain the two most sacred possessions: knowledge and wisdom. And with knowledge there came ability. Though we were not blessed with wings, we were given the ability to obtain them.

Curiosity offers a general and undisputable motivation for space travel, yet are countless sums of money being provided simply to give scientists something to mollify their eternal thirst for new knowledge and frontiers? Though the scientists seem to be the only ones concerned with space exploration now, in the future it will have a tremendous effect on each of us. Our earth is becoming exhausted, and our demand for almost everything is growing daily. Our tremendous swell of population is forcing us to extract vital materials from a planet incapable of regeneration. Someday our dying world will require a steady supply of raw materials to furnish food and necessities to the societies of the future. The possibilities of wealth in our sun's family are great. Life, health, and luxury are all offered in some manner by the trillions of miles of unknown. And the greatest luxury is, of course, room.

And from reaching out into space we will gain knowledge that we and our young must have to survive and flourish. And through the eyes of the lunar observatory we will gain knowledge of the stars that lie in the path of the destiny we so seldom think about in our material world. But there is yet another aspect of space travel which may seem philosophical, but it is even more concrete than the need of material resources and technical knowledge. It may be one of the few ways to save our nation from corruption, dehumanization, and general decline. It is clear that our great nation is declining from internal conflict, and the reason is unrest. The urge and yet inability to pioneer new frontiers. And eventually a stagnant society must grow foul. The oceans may be the beginning of the answer, but when the earth is crowded and depleted we must reach upward where there is an infinity of space filled with uncountable planets of fresh resources. Each planet a frontier to be explored and tamed by a new species of the hearty pioneer. Each one offered free in exchange for curiosity and courage.

Can our current decline be reversed by the discovery of a new frontier and the awakening of the pioneer spirit in those who live only to die? Or will the history of the United States prove analogous to the rise and fall of the Roman Empire in the historic literature of a future society?

For these reasons space travel is something we cannot hold back. It can be delayed, but it is progress. And there will always be those with the will to move forward and outward, to add to our knowledge and better our existence. And in this way it is necessity. The universe is a world which bustles with life and activity, and we must depart from our cradle, the earth, and join a world far different than our wildest imaginations. We will discover intelligent races, and learn to live and share together with our superiors. For the intelligence of the universe will exist in peace and harmony as it sees that which is to come: The Ultimate.

Those who insist this has no significance to the practical world of today have only to observe. For what is our problem today but lack of unity. Our world is divided, both in

boundaries and in thought. Attempting to achieve unity through politics is like walking through an endless maze. The people of the world must be united, not through a written agreement, but united in heart and soul for a common cause. And what better cause is there than the exploration and colonization of space. We have already shown that we can talk and share freely on the topic of space. And for one brief moment in the summer of 1969, the inhabitants of the entire world shared feelings of relief, joy, admiration, and pride. They were united.

Maybe someday soon we will live and work and learn together in space, a limitless void with no boundaries to separate race or opinion. A place where all men brave danger and the unknown together. A place where all men strive to reach a common goal.

And the brilliant jewels of the night shine ever onward. Forever beckoning. We struggle upward, ever upward. And they wait . . .

#### MORE SUPPORT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

### HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, policemen, firemen, judges, and corrections officers in the Cleveland area have spoken with a unified voice in support of H.R. 11677, the Public Safety, Criminal Justice, and Correctional Personnel Benefits Act, which I introduced last November. This bill would provide a \$50,000 benefit to the family of any of these officials killed in the line of duty. I would now insert in the RECORD six additional letters of support I have received.

I am also very grateful for the support shown by my colleagues in the House for this legislation. Yesterday, I reintroduced the bill with 21 cosponsors, who are as follows:

WILLIAM ANDERSON, PHILLIP BURTON, FRANK CLARK, DANIEL FLOOD, WALTER FLOWERS, EDWARD GARMATZ, SAM GIBBONS, SEYMOUR HALPERN, KEN HECHLER, and HENRY HELSTOSKI.

WALTER JONES, JACK KEMP, RALPH METCALFE, WILMER MIZELL, CLAUDE PEPPER, CHARLES RANGEL, WILLIAM ROY, PAUL SARBANES, SAM STEIGER, SAMUEL STRATTON, and CHARLES VANIK.

The letters follow:

JANUARY 5, 1972.

HON. JAMES V. STANTON,  
Congressman, 20th District of Ohio, Longworth Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANTON: The members of the North-Eastern Ohio Fire Chiefs' Association Inc. are very desirous to be able to endorse H.R. 11677 which was introduced by you on November 9, 1971.

It is gratifying to know that the fire service has a member of the Congress who realizes that fire fighters have been shot at in the performance of their duties. That the families of the fire fighters who are subjected to these hazards should receive the same benefits as law enforcement officers families.

May the members of our Association thank you from the bottom of our hearts for your consideration and efforts in trying to help our loved ones.

Sincerely,

EUGENE E. ROGERS,  
North-Eastern Ohio Fire Chiefs' Association, Inc.

DECEMBER 20, 1971.

HON. JAMES V. STANTON,  
Member of Congress, House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We would whole-heartedly like to thank you for your strong opposition to Mr. Richard Velde concerning excluding the firefighter from the \$50,000 death benefit bill. It always makes one feel good to know he has support in his chosen profession. We feel whether a man gives his life as a result of a felonious act or not is of little importance, but that he has given his life for the benefit of his fellow man is the point. Firefighters risk their lives daily, and this death benefit is a small price to pay for such valor.

Again, we thank you for your support.

Respectfully,

DANIEL E. KOSTER,  
Secretary Local 1814 I.A.F.F., Westlake Fire Department.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,  
Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Upon reading the comments on the opposition to the inclusion of firefighters in the \$50,000 death benefit bill made by Mr. Richard Velde, associate administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the Justice Department, one wonders if there is any justice or logic in excluding the firefighter.

Although there may be more policemen that die in the line of duty as a result of a felonious act, there are more firefighters die in the line of duty in a year.

A firefighter risks his life protecting the lives and property of his fellow citizens and now has the honor of being a member of the country's most hazardous occupation.

Whether a member of the safety forces dies as a result of a felonious act or simply protecting the lives and property of others is not, in our opinion, the question. The fact remains that an individual has paid the supreme sacrifice for the benefit of his fellow man, and he still leaves a widow and all the responsibilities a policeman would leave.

Mr. Velde should also be aware of the many assaults made upon our firefighters, not only during civil disturbances but also during day-to-day activity.

We feel the price that would be paid to cover the firefighter under this bill is indeed a small price to pay for the sacrifice these men make for the benefit of their fellow man.

Respectfully,

DANIEL E. KOSTER,  
Secretary, Local No. 1814 I.A.F.F., Westlake Fire Department.

DECEMBER 15, 1971.

HON. JAMES V. STANTON,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to express, to you, my support for the bill you introduced as H.B. 11677. I would like to commend you for your action. As a Fire Chief, I am vitally interested in the welfare of firemen. The proposal to include only policemen, Sheriff's deputies, and highway patrolmen, in a financial benefit, in case of death in the line of duty, is certainly not justified, in my opinion. Statistics prove that the fire service is the most hazardous occupation in the country. Firemen also meet with violent death. I can not see any difference between whether a man gets shot to death or if a fire occurs and he is killed by smoke, falling walls, etc. This is why I believe you are taking a realistic view, compared to some other men, regarding Federal compensation to the families of safety personnel being killed in the line of duty.

Keep up your good work and we in the fire service all thank you for your concern and efforts.

Respectfully,

EDMUND W. GEIGER,  
Fire Chief, Westlake Fire Department,  
Westlake, Ohio.

DECEMBER 10, 1971.

HON. JAMES V. STANTON,  
House of Representatives, Congress of the  
United States, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN STANTON: As promised in my December 1st, 1971 letter of endorsement to you regarding H.R. #11677 regarding survivor benefits for probation officers who are killed in the line of duty (and other associated public employees) you will be happy to know that at our State organization meeting on Dec. 8, 1971, our Executive Committee gave unanimous endorsement of your Bill and directed me to correspond with you immediately regarding this matter.

Please advise me if there is anything further we can do to help in this important legislative matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. JANESZ,  
President.

DECEMBER 8, 1971.

HON. JAMES V. STANTON,  
Congress of the United States, House of  
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to address your Office relative to the Bill H.R. 11677. I would hope that you and all Members of Congress would vote for this legislation.

I believe we must recognize the need in this area and provide some means, whereby, the family of an Officer killed while on duty is not placed in such a financial position as to be dependent on friends, relatives and society. It is not a precedent setting act as it is now a part of many governmental agencies.

Thus, I again request your support in this matter.

Very truly yours,

LESLIE R. BLACK,  
Chief, Rocky River Police Department.

DECEMBER 10, 1971.

JAMES V. STANTON,  
State Representative, Longworth Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANTON: I am writing this in hopes of your full support of H.R. Bill No. 11677.

With the lack of support in some parts of our country towards the law enforcement officers and the disregard for their lives, this bill would help in some ways.

I have seen the families of dead police officers, and the financial crises they have gone through. Most of these families are young. They were just beginning to get their feet on the ground when a tragedy of this type came up. Police officers are not wealthy. They do not make a great deal of money. Most work on their days off and any extra hours they have. They dedicate their lives to helping people just as you have, but with a much smaller financial return.

Knowing your record and admiring you as long as I have, I know you will support this bill totally.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my feelings as I have.

Sincerely,

DONALD B. SAMKO,  
South Russell Village, Chief of Police.

#### HIDDEN PROFITS FROM A CLEAN AMERICA

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in the February-March

1972 issue of National Wildlife magazine, published by the National Wildlife Federation making clear the economic aspects of waste and pollution. This excellent article, "Hidden Profits From a Clean America," merits careful consideration by every thinking American:

**PRESIDENT SAYS CLEANUP SAVES UNITED STATES \$12 BILLION A YEAR**

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 1, 1980.—In a dramatic report from the White House, the President today exuberantly proclaimed the 1980's a "Decade of Better Living."

"Pollution cleanup launched during the early 1970's," he declared, "has improved our health, saved us money, and made possible a higher quality of life."

"Gross damages from air and water pollution have been reduced by \$22.2 billion annually. This is a net saving to American taxpayer of \$12 billion a year—after paying the cost of cleanup. Each family's share of this saving is \$200 a year," he said.

**CLEANER, GREENER AMERICA**

"More important," the President continued, "we have a much cleaner, greener America than in those murky days of 1972 when the far-sighted warned us: 'America is dying.' And the faint-hearted complained: 'We can't do anything about it.' And the short-sighted said: 'We can't afford it.'"

The President cited two reasons most responsible for triggering the pollution cleanup: "First, Americans decided back in 1972, they did not want to live in a world of dirty water and foul air. Second, they made the great discovery it would pay them—not cost them—to clean up pollution."

**MESSAGE HIGHLIGHTS**

**Health:** "Americans are saving \$4 billion a year in health benefits from air pollution cleanup alone . . . cases of emphysema, bronchitis, asthma and lung cancer have dropped dramatically."

**Property:** "Pollution damage to property and materials has been reduced by more than \$6 billion a year. We don't need to paint our houses so often. Cars do not corrode, clothes and furnishings last longer."

**Fisheries:** "Clean water has enabled the United States to rebuild commercial and sport fisheries . . . we now fish for shrimp in waters that had no shrimp for more than a decade."

**Recreation:** "Cleanup of rivers, lakes and beaches sparked a recreation boom, with dollar benefits in the billions."

**AIR, WATER POLLUTION NOW COST UNITED STATES \$28.9 BILLION A YEAR**

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 1, 1972.—Uncle Sam's bill for air and water pollution damage has jumped to a staggering \$28.9 billion annually.

Pollution is now costing each person in the U.S. \$137 a year—\$480 per family. And the total is climbing fast!

The Third Annual Environmental Quality Index, published by the National Wildlife Federation, points out that pollution is damaging health, driving down property values, killing plant and wildlife, and eroding the quality of human life.

**CAN WE AFFORD CLEANUP?**

Despite this gloomy picture, there is a rising clamor that the United States cannot afford to clean up pollution . . . that it will cost more than \$100 billion . . . that taxes are already too high . . . that some industrial plants will have to close, with loss of jobs.

"But the biggest untold story in America today is that it will pay us to clean up pollution," asserts Thomas L. Kimball, executive director, National Wildlife Federation.

Kimball cites these dramatic figures gath-

ered after intensive digging by a Federation investigative team:

**Air pollution** causes damages of \$16.1 billion annually. But economists estimate about two-thirds of these damages could be eliminated by 1976 if the Federal air clean program is fully funded, implemented and enforced. So Uncle Sam, by investing \$3.9 billion annually, can get back savings of \$6.8 billion. One family's share of these savings would be \$113 per year.

**FAMILY CAN SAVE \$200**

**Water pollution** causes damages estimated at \$12.8 billion annually. Approximately 90 percent of these damages could be eliminated by 1980 with a program costing about \$6.3 billion annually. This would provide a net saving of \$5.2 billion annually. And one family's share of this would be \$87 per year.

"Cleanup program could save a family \$200 annually by 1980—and give them fresher air, cleaner water and better health," says Kimball.

**HIDDEN SAVINGS FROM A CLEANER AMERICA**

(By Thomas L. Kimball)

Americans can have a cleaner America by 1980—and save \$12 billion a year at the same time.

This is no pipe dream. It is the sober estimate of responsible environmental experts.

This dramatic figure was brought to light after intensive digging by a National Wildlife Federation investigative team which interviewed scores of environmental experts and economists during recent months.

The pollution arithmetic is simple:

1. Nationwide bill for damages from air and water pollution is estimated at \$28.9 billion annually. Your family's share of that is \$481.

2. A reasonable cleanup program will require an investment of \$10.2 billion annually. Your family's share: \$170.

3. But this cleanup will reduce pollution damages by a whopping \$22.2 billion! Your family's share: \$370.

4. You pay out \$170 for cleanup and reduce your pollution damage bill by \$370, for a net savings of \$200 in your annual expenditures. More importantly, cleaner air and cleaner water give a new lease on life to all creatures. Be they eagles, oysters, or men. Here's how we arrived at these startling figures.

**Air pollution:** The President's own Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) reports that the current air cleanup campaign will cost \$23.7 billion between 1970 and 1975. Economists estimate this will reduce air pollution damages by two-thirds by 1976.

Polluted air causes the following damages, says the CEQ: human health, \$6 billion; materials and vegetation, \$4.9 billion; lowering of property values, \$5.2 billion.

Some economists believe these figures are too conservative because they do not include shortened life due to illness or loss of scenic values. One expert told us: "If we continue to establish comprehensive air pollution standards—and if we have the courage to enforce them—by 1976 we can reduce air pollution by 80 to 90 percent!"

**Water pollution:** The story here is equally dramatic, though specific figures are unavailable and Federal officials are almost embarrassed by the lack of data.

Nevertheless, the Federation talked with economists who have researched this problem for years. They estimate that water pollution costs the United States \$12.8 billion annually. They also believe pollution damages can be reduced 90 percent by 1980.

Polluted water costs you and the nation untold billions in reduced output, increased expenses, higher taxes, and, most importantly, a generally poorer life.

The polluted Delaware estuary alone represents \$350 million in lost recreational opportunities. One-fifth of the nation's

shellfish beds are closed because of water pollution. A single child born retarded because of chemical contamination of the water his mother drinks can cost society \$250,000 in remedial training and custodial care.

These figures and conclusions raise inevitable questions:

Are these estimates anywhere near accurate?

Economists and environmental experts freely admits that research data is skimpy. Some contend the government has been derelict in not running return-on-investment studies similar to those which all industries do before committing their dollars to any new project. However, our sources defend the figures in this article as conservative—both in damages and in ultimate savings. (I invite anyone who believes he has more reliable figures to speak up—environmental cleanup must be a team effort.)

When does the taxpayer-consumer start getting back the money he's invested?

Air savings should be fully effective by 1976; water savings, by 1980. Based on our experts' figures, the Federation estimates the average family must invest a total of approximately \$500 by 1975, without return. But by 1970 the family will recover this \$500, and by 1980 each family will have an annual savings of \$200.

But will people make this investment?

Yes. For more than 200 years Americans have been profit motivated. Show them where they can make or save a buck and you'll get action. But I hope that dollar economic will never be our sole guide. Quality of life is a concern that transcends dollars and cents. Happily, pollution cleanup meets both criteria—it helps improve our quality of life, and it saves us money.

But what about those estimates of \$105 billion to clean up pollution?

That's the figure given in the report of the President's Council on Environmental Quality. But, by the Council's own admission, this figure is inflated since it contains a \$43.5 billion estimate designated for solid waste disposal. And, to quote the CEQ, "This figure greatly overstates the costs required for meeting a higher standard of environmental quality, since the overwhelming bulk of those costs is for garbage pickup, a service traditionally provided in urban areas (and currently being paid for)."

Is pollution cleanup on schedule?

The Clean Air Act of 1970 has sufficient strength to accomplish goals set forth in this article. Our air pollution figures are valid—assuming these IFS: If current strict standards are not lessened . . . If timetables set forth are met . . . If regulations are enforced.

Water pollution figures are based on the Water Quality Act of 1965. However, in my opinion, this effort to clean up has been a failure to date because standards are not uniform or complete and state enforcement has lagged. For example: Only 27 states have "No further degradation" clauses. Current hope is the new Water Pollution Bill which will probably pass Congress early this year. It sets up strict Federal standards for effluent discharge by the industrial polluter and provides for tough enforcement.

What can an individual do?

Be informed. Do not be misled by sweeping statements, for example, that "pollution cleanup will cost too much," or by simplistic slogans like "What do you want—fish or jobs?" Attend public hearings which are provided for by law. Remember that both air and water pollution laws also provide that you as a citizen can bring a lawsuit directly against a polluter, or the Environmental Protection Agency itself when it can be shown the government has not acted to enforce its own regulations.

## STANDARDS FOR LIGHT RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION NEEDED

## HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, today I join with many concerned colleagues in introducing a bipartisan bill of enormous benefit to Americans who build homes and families who want to buy them.

Our bill, amending the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, would require the Department of Labor to establish different safety standards for the light residential construction and heavy or commercial construction industries.

Both industries currently come under the same safety standards imposed by the 1970 act. These regulations take the unfair and unrealistic position all construction, whether it be rebuilding a back porch, constructing a single-family home, or building a huge skyscraper office building, is similar enough to be governed by the same set of safety standards.

The facts do not support this assumption. Clearly, there are disparities between the two industries—differences in hazards to employees and in average size of contracting and subcontracting firms involved.

Failing to take these differences into account, present laws work a real hardship upon builders involved in light residential construction and remodeling and upon families who need their services. In recent actions, the Department of Labor has appeared cognizant of disparate needs of the light and heavy construction industries. But these differences must be recognized by statute to provide for development of new, more appropriate standards for the light construction industry. Our bill will insure this.

Some constituents who have been building single and multifamily housing for many years have written me about inequities created by present standards. They tell me cost of meeting these unreasonable requirements and/or fines for noncompliance force them to raise selling prices by hundreds of dollars. One prominent contractor in my hometown, Chattanooga, estimates he has had to raise the price of the average single-family dwelling by \$400 to cover these expenses.

For the average middle-income family, these sums represent the margin between being able to finance a new, modern home and remaining in inadequate, crowded housing.

In case after case, we find present standards covering light residential construction forcing small contractors out of business. Those who build perhaps two or three homes at a time simply cannot meet these higher costs for unrealistic safety standards. Those who do not close their businesses entirely must cut their work force drastically, adding to our unemployment rolls.

Men with years of experience in light construction tell me they have never seen accidents in the homebuilding industry

of the type current standards are designed to prevent. Safety standards appropriate for large, complex projects—highways, dams, office buildings, and high-rise apartments—are simply out of line for light residential construction, limited by our bill to "residential structures of three stories or less without an elevator."

Nonapplicable safety standards for homebuilders are bringing up the cost of new homes without improving protection for workmen. Implementation of these standards is denying hundreds of Americans the new housing they need.

The homebuilding industry has displayed continuing concern for safety standards reflecting hazards involved in light construction. The National Association of Home Builders, for instance, has set aside nearly \$100,000 to develop a separate set of standards for light construction through the American National Standards Institute. These funds are also being used to develop a large-scale program to acquaint membership of the association with its obligations to employees under existing law.

Clearly, the light construction industry wants to operate with reasonable safety standards. Our bill would insure that the Secretary of Labor would develop these standards.

Our bill is in accord with section 6 of the 1970 Safety Act, providing for a 2-year period during which the Department of Labor "would develop standards for those industries and situations not covered by existing Federal standards." The 1969 Construction Safety Act, adopted primarily for heavy construction, formed the basis for light residential construction standards under the 1970 act. There is considerable doubt Congress, in passing the 1969 law, intended these standards to apply to light construction.

Our bill will designate separate standards intended specifically for the light residential construction industry. It will mark a big step forward in meeting modern needs of both homebuilders and homeowners.

## UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

## HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 54th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine.

Ukraine, a nation of some 47 million people, is the largest captive non-Russian nation in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe. It has figured prominently of late in many discussions, including the United Nations where it was mentioned during the debate on China.

Again in this Congress, I have been working with my colleagues in our continuing effort to obtain approval of the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The need for such a special committee is even more urgent today than it was when we first made the proposal.

It is essential that we join in showing a genuine and effective interest in the colonial non-Russian areas of the U.S.S.R.

## EMBROILED IN OIL

## HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this week's New Republic contains an excellent column entitled "Embroided in Oil." The article, in addition to providing a brief summary of the findings of the recent hearings Senator PROXMIRE held on the oil industry, points out some of the now all too obvious faults in the present Government policy toward the oil industry.

I am including the column "Embroided in Oil" in the RECORD today with the hope that many of the issues it raises will be the focus of a strong and vigorous public debate in the coming months.

The time to examine the Government policy toward the oil industry is now. Our present system of oil import quotas, depletion allowances, weak conservation laws and tax credits is costing the American consumer billions of dollars annually, for which he receives only high fuel costs and a rapidly deteriorating environment, and higher personal taxes.

If the present policy is to be changed, it will be change brought about by a strong and rising protest by the American consumer. Faced with the most powerful lobby in Washington, the task the consumer faces is not easy, but the fate of the proposals to improve the present system lie in his hands.

## EMBROILED IN OIL

To help President Nixon keep prices down during Phase II, Sen. Proxmire (D., Wis.) has been investigating government policies that drive industries, prices up. As a start, his subcommittee on priorities and economy in government took a look at the oil industry.

Oil and gas provide 75 percent of the nation's energy fuels; virtually every consumer product has touched oil or gas at some stage in the factory if it isn't actually made from them. Oil is our richest industry: net earnings of the 91 leading petroleum corporations in 1969 topped \$50 billion, exceeding telephone, steel and autos. It also gets some of the biggest government plums. Proxmire and his witnesses estimated that the oil import quotas and special tax deductions cost consumers \$9 billion each year, or \$180 per family.

Proxmire started with the oil import quotas, which keep cheap foreign oil out so that domestic companies can charge more. The Treasury Department estimates the quotas inflate oil prices \$5 billion each year. A barrel of the common one-percent-sulfur oil was selling in New York for \$4.80 on January 3, but only \$2.09 in Rotterdam. In the first 12 years after Eisenhower imposed the quota system by executive order, American oil companies increased domestic exploration 11.5 percent while they bolstered foreign exploration 63.8 percent. Between 1965 and 1970, quotas cost consumers \$7.4 billion more than in 1959-64, 2.3 times as much as companies spent exploring for both oil and gas. Taxpayers could have subsidized exploration costs directly and saved over \$4 billion.

The oil industry thrives on a battery of

special tax favors enjoyed by no other American industry. The 19 largest oil companies, grossing \$8.8 billion in 1970, paid on the average an 8.7 percent federal income tax; most other corporations paid 50 percent. The juiciest plum, of course, is the percentage depletion deduction, which allows companies to recover capital they have invested in buying drilling rights. The theory behind the deduction was sound enough when Congress accepted it in 1918: oil is a high-risk business, involving numerous failures as well as successes. Once a company strikes oil, its capital invested in drilling depreciates as the oil well dries up. All businesses get similar deductions, recovering a fraction of their original investment each year until they get back the full amount. But in oil, the depreciation is unusually generous. Thomas Field, a long-time oil tax expert at the Justice and Treasury Departments, told the Proxmire committee how this works: if an oil producer invests \$10,000 buying drilling rights, strikes oil and then sells the oil for \$100,000 each year for ten years, the depletion deduction would be \$22,000 each year for the full life of the well.

The oil producer recovers \$220,000—22 times the original investment. "It is entirely possible for petroleum producers to enjoy tax free 'recoveries of capital' that are hundreds or even thousands of times larger than the amounts originally invested," said Field. According to a Treasury study last year, the 25 biggest oil companies made 20 times as much from the oil depletion allowance in 1969 as they would have from normal deductions. Proxmire doesn't think the oil companies deserve it. The Treasury study shows the 25 biggest companies lost only 1.5 percent of their total operating costs drilling "dry holes" that didn't produce any oil.

The oil depletion system has one side effect the government didn't count on: it encourages oil producers to hike the price of crude oil as high as the market will bear. Since the companies deduct 22 percent of the sales income of crude oil at the well, there's a built-in incentive to raise prices to maximize deductions. There's another tax benefit that promotes high prices: most of the crude oil in America is produced by the same companies that refine it. They're vertically integrated corporate giants that control every step of the oil process, from drilling and producing to transporting, refining and marketing. The biggest companies like Gulf and Humble produce at least 82 percent of the crude oil they refine; literally, they buy most of their oil from themselves. The Internal Revenue Service taxes the production end of the oil business at a much lower rate than the refining end, so oil companies try to siphon as much of their profits as possible into production. The higher the price of crude oil, the higher their production profits and the lower their taxes. Since 1969, oil companies have boosted crude oil prices two times, by 23 percent.

Five of the eight largest US oil corporations (Standard of New Jersey and California, Gulf, Texaco, and Mobil) control half of the non-Communist world's oil, and the federal government gives them further tax breaks overseas. These companies pay large royalties to foreign governments, which the Internal Revenue Service lets them deduct dollar for dollar from their federal income tax. As a result, some companies pay no federal taxes on millions of dollars earned overseas. It's a bonanza that makes exploring the oil business extra profitable abroad, which helps explain why the oil giants increased foreign exploration during the sixties. These foreign royalties shrink oil corporate taxes by \$2 to \$2.5 billion each year, according to the Treasury Department. If the government is trying to encourage domestic oil production—the only justification for oil import quotas—then the whole tax system is "ridiculous," Proxmire said.

The government has toyed with the possibility of changing oil laws, but reform never gets far in Congress, the Interior Department (which administers oil laws) or the White House. The oil industry has at least a half dozen lobby groups in Washington and ranks among the largest contributors to political campaigns. Directors of the American Petroleum Institute contributed \$430,000 to the Republicans in 1968, and \$30,600 to the Democrats, according to the Citizens Research Foundation.

In February 1970, a Cabinet Task Force, which included most of the cabinet secretaries plus other top government officials, concluded that oil import quotas were "unacceptable." They said the system hasn't protected the national security, but has "spawned a host of special arrangements and exceptions . . . has imposed high costs and inefficiencies on consumers and the economy." Nixon "dissolved" the task force and established an Oil Policy Committee (essentially the same group under a new name), which went into reverse and backed import quotas. Congress did lower the oil depletion deduction from 27.5 percent to 22 percent in 1969, for the first time in over 40 years—but the percentage points have scarcely made a difference. Industry profits are steadily increasing.

Government oil experts say they can't even begin to reform oil laws until they learn more about the oil business, the only major industry that decides which statistics it wants to report and which ones it doesn't. The corporations won't tell how much profits they make from oil production and how much from refining; they won't tell how much royalties they pay in each country, but instead report a lump figure for "foreign and some states' taxes." The Treasury has some new vital statistics on the 25 largest corporations but won't release them.

Most of the information at Proxmire's hearings was old to those who understand the oil business, but it reminded the public that the government isn't doing absolutely everything possible to keep prices down. But then, "When it comes to a fight between the industry on the one hand and the consumers on the other . . . you know who wins," says Proxmire.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S EDUCATION BUDGET: THE CONTINUED GAP BETWEEN PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE

### HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the President's fiscal year 1973 budget proposals for education programs are another dismal example of the disparity between this administration's rhetoric and its performance.

#### THE NIXON RECORD

When Mr. Nixon was campaigning for the Presidency 4 years ago, he said:

When we talk about cutting the expense of government—the one area we can't short-change is education.

Yet Mr. Nixon has consistently asked Congress to cut funds for elementary and secondary schools, and in addition has urged the outright abolition of a large part of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Mr. Nixon frequently—indeed, almost constantly—reminds us that:

No qualified student should be denied a college education because he cannot afford to pay for it.

Yet Mr. Nixon has also repeatedly called for abolition of the most successful student aid program we have—national defense student loans.

Mr. Nixon is fond of mentioning his high regard for young children. Indeed, in 1969 he called for:

A national commitment to healthful and stimulating development for all American children during the first five years of life.

Yet when Congress passed a bill to do exactly that—to provide such opportunities not only for poor children, but for children of middle-income families as well—Mr. Nixon vetoed it.

Mr. Speaker, the record is replete with examples of this kind, and if anyone needs further proof of the hostility of this administration toward education, I note that four of 11 of Mr. Nixon's vetoes to date have been of bills making education authorization or appropriations.

This is not an impressive record, and one would think that Mr. Nixon would not be proud of it. Yet yesterday, when the budget message was communicated to us, it quickly became apparent that the gap between Mr. Nixon's inflated rhetoric and his performance is not only undiminished, but appears to be widening.

#### PETULANCE VERSUS PERFORMANCE

Mr. Nixon's posture is now one of petulance. He reviews the several education proposals he has made, including "special revenue sharing," establishment of a National Foundation on Higher Education, and "reform" of higher education student aid programs, and chides Congress for not having acted affirmatively. As an example of Congress' supposed malingering, he singles out his student assistance proposal, saying:

I believe that no qualified student should be denied a college education because he cannot afford to pay for it. Most Americans and most Congressmen agree. I have proposed the legislation that will make this a reality. I am ready to sign that legislation. But there it sits, in Congress, while thousands of young people miss their chance.

The fact is, of course, that Mr. Nixon's student aid proposals would not make any additional money available to insure that "no qualified student is denied a college education because he cannot afford to pay for it."

On the contrary, Mr. Nixon proposes to dismantle the most effective student aid program we have—national defense student loans—and use the funds thus freed to bolster the educational opportunity grant program. It apparently has not occurred to Mr. Nixon that if he is really concerned that no qualified student should be denied a college education for financial reasons, the answer is not to trade off one group of students against another, but to provide student aid programs with the funds necessary to accommodate all students who need assistance.

But such reasoning is apparently unattractive to an administration more concerned with words than action, for in his budget proposal, Mr. Nixon again

seeks to do that which he promised he would not do—shortchange education.

#### CUTBACK ON EDUCATION SUPPORT

Mr. Speaker, the following are some examples of the low priority Mr. Nixon accords to education in his new budget:

Federal support for schools under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would be cut by \$239 million.

Thirty elementary and secondary aid programs, including Federal assistance for educationally deprived children—ESEA I—Federal impact aid—Public Law 874—and the Vocational Education Act would be abolished.

Construction grants for colleges and universities would be abolished.

National Defense Student Loans would be abolished.

Aid to Land Grant colleges would be cut by 80 percent.

Support for public library services would be cut by 34 percent.

Mr. Speaker, from the concern Mr. Nixon expressed last week for the financial plight of the Nation's schools, one would have expected a budget message far different from the one sent up yesterday.

But as we have seen in the past, what the President says and what he does are almost invariably in contradiction when it comes to education.

The fact is that at the same time President Nixon is recommending \$6 billion in additional money for the military, he seeks to dismantle some of the most significant Federal education initiatives undertaken during the past 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, the record speaks for itself.

As the President himself told us last week, a good part of what American education needs now is help in the form of a firm financial commitment, but that Mr. Nixon is apparently unwilling to provide.

#### ANNIVERSARY SALUTE TO KTLA BY SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AREA DELEGATION

#### HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, television station KTLA, serving Los Angeles and a large portion of southern California, is currently commemorating its silver anniversary. Today the Members of Congress representing the area served by KTLA join in extending congratulations and in saluting KTLA on this anniversary of commendable service to the people of southern California.

KTLA has a very proud and distinguished history. On January 22, 1947, it became the first commercially licensed TV station in the West, having begun 8 years earlier as an experimental station from Paramount Studios in Los Angeles.

During its first year, it became the first west coast station to televise a speech of the President of the United States. During the Kathy Fiscus "well" tragedy KTLA provided extended live

on the spot coverage over 27½ continuous suspenseful hours. KTLA broadcast the first live telecast from out at sea, from the U.S.S. *Valley Forge*.

Other "firsts" include introduction of Lawrence Welk to television audiences, initial kinescope syndication of a program, first live telecast of an atom bomb blast, and original color programs broadcast in Los Angeles, the first being the colorful Rose Bowl Parade in 1955.

KTLA was the first, and is still the only station to design and operate a flying remote unit, "The Telecopter." Coverage provided by this means was initiated in May of 1958.

Because of KTLA's service to stations all over the country in making coverage available to them, KTLA was awarded a special Governor's citation from the Hollywood chapter of the National Academy of TV Arts and Sciences, becoming the first California station to receive this honor.

KTLA has, through quality programming, served the public interest well, and the Members of Congress in the KTLA viewing area are pleased to make special note of the celebration of its first 25 years.

I am also attaching a list of some of the distinguishing achievements during KTLA's history, and the dates when they were begun:

#### A CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF CHANNEL 5, KTLA—AN UNMATCHED HISTORY OF TELEVISION FIRSTS

1939—W6XYZ (experimental station) begins from Paramount Studios in Los Angeles.

Fall, 1942—First telecast inside a motion picture studio, Paramount—"This Gun for Hire".

1946—First telecast of wrestling, boxing and most other sports.

January 1, 1947—First telecast of Rose Bowl Parade.

January 22, 1947—First TV commercially licensed station west of Chicago . . . changing W6XYZ to KTLA—Channel 5.

February 30, 1947—First on-the-spot news coverage—Pico Street Explosion.

October 30, 1947—First man-on-the-street broadcast "Meet Me In Hollywood".

January 11, 1948—First to present "Pantomime Quiz", winner of the first Emmy.

July 12, 1948—First west coast station to televise a President's speech—President Harry Truman.

August 7, 1948—First to present Hopalong Cassidy which started the first national TV craze.

Fall, 1948—First telecast of a movie premiere—"Emperor Waltz".

March 7, 1949—First to present "Cecil & Beany", before it went on to become a national phenomenon.

April 9, 1949—First extended live on-the-spot coverage, 27½ continuous suspenseful hours during the Kathy Fiscus Well Tragedy.

July, 1949—First live telecast from out at sea—U.S.S. *Valley Forge*.

September 20, 1949—First regularly scheduled remote program—"City At Night".

1949—First kinescope syndication of a program—"Time For Beany".

May 18, 1951—First to present Lawrence Welk on television.

May 23, 1951—First coverage of an actual police investigation of a crime—Patty Jean Hull kidnapping.

April 22, 1952—First live telecast of an Atom Bomb Blast.

April 22, 1952—First station to feed program (Atom Test) to all three networks.

July 1952—First Independent to cover a major political convention—Chicago.

January 1, 1955—First Los Angeles station to originate color programs—"Rose Bowl Parade".

May 1958—First and still the only station to design and operate a flying remote unit—"The Telecopter".

May 13, 1964—Golden West Broadcasters receives FCC license to operate KTLA, transferring ownership from Paramount.

June 1, 1969—First and only station to design and operate the world's only color jet telecopter!

February 9, 1971—First and only station to make its exclusive live ground and Telecopter coverage of the California earthquake available free to any TV station anywhere . . . which brought KTLA yet another first.

February 9, 1971—First station to have its news transmission on every one of the seven L.A. VHF TV stations simultaneously at various times throughout the day of the emergency!

February 9, 1971—First Independent station to have its news picture transmitted on stations throughout California, live on national network and to Europe via Telstar satellite during the earthquake impending dam-break emergency.

March 21, 1971—First California station to win a special Governor's Citation from the National Academy of TV Arts and Sciences, Hollywood Chapter for making coverage available to stations all over the country.

#### TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE

#### HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, Friday, January 28, marks the 25th year of service in the U.S. House of Representatives for my good friend and colleague, Congressman BOB JONES of Scottsboro, Ala.

During this time, Congressman JONES has distinguished himself as one of the outstanding legislators, if not the outstanding legislator here in the Congress. He is one of the hardest working and most dedicated public servants I have ever known.

On this special occasion I offer my warmest congratulations to Congressman JONES. I would like to place in the RECORD at this point a recent newspaper article by Phil Smith of the Huntsville Times, which recounts, in an excellent manner, Congressman JONES' remarkable career:

#### TWENTY-FIVE YEARS ON THE HILL

(By Philip W. Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Sept. 24, 1946, dawned bright and clear in North Alabama. Schools had been closed the week before for the cotton-picking break, and the harvest was well under way.

Voters were going to the polls that day for the fifth time since the regular Democratic primary in May. On the ballot were seven Democrats seeking the Eighth District seat in Congress, which had been vacated when John Sparkman resigned following his election to the U.S. Senate.

One of the candidates was Judge Robert Emmett Jones, county judge of Jackson County. He preferred just plain "Bob" Jones.

According to a story by Mrs. Martha Witt Smith, then a reporter for The Huntsville Times, the campaign had been "largely personalized, waged on a person-to-person basis."

When election officials finished counting the votes in the early hours of Sept. 25—there were no voting machines then—Jones lead the slate, primarily because of the vote in his home county. Jackson County had 10,300 registered voters at that time. More than half of them—5,361—voted for their county judge while his opponents received a combined vote of only 139 in the county.

The almost unanimous support from Jackson County was enough to give Judge Jones only a plurality in the large field, however, and not a majority. He faced a run-off election Oct. 22 with state Sen. Jim Smith of Tusculum.

That election was described by on newspaper as a "listless and almost issueless affair" but when the election-weary citizens of North Alabama had cast their ballots, the young county judge again emerged as the victor—16,787 to 11,260.

The home counties of the candidates had been the key. Jones' supporters piled up 6,884 votes in Jackson while the best Smith could do was 4,437 in Colbert. Voting was light and fairly evenly split in the other five counties of the district—Madison, Limestone, Morgan, Lawrence and Lauderdale.

This time the Jackson Countian had apparently convinced a few more of his neighbors of his qualifications. He lost only 104 votes in Jackson while he picked up 493 in Smith's Colbert County. Both candidates had conceded the other's home county when the runoff began and Jones never made a speech in Colbert.

He and Smith campaigned together part of the time in the middle portion of the district to cut down on expenses. At times they even shared the same hotel room. One story has it that the two candidates checked into their hotel one night after a day of stumping together and a Smith supporter mistook Jones for the man he was backing. The voter drew Jones aside and whispered his encouragement, adding that "we're going to beat this Jones fellow." Not wanting to embarrass the man, Jones thanked him and replied, "We'll do our best."

A more unusual aspect of the campaign was that Judge Jones did not campaign in Jackson County. He left the job at home to his volunteer supporters there, headed by Sanford Lee of Scottsboro, a young World War II veteran like the candidate.

The judge had no paid staff during the election. For clerical workers he depended on young women from Jackson County who would "just show up" at his headquarters in Scottsboro each morning.

By the runoff, the cotton harvest was in full swing and Jones' volunteers feared many farm hands would find it more important to stay in the fields than to go vote for the sixth time that year.

There is no way to tell whether that would have happened, however, since the Jones volunteers took no chances. According to news accounts of the election, a number of cars—estimates ranged from 250 to 400—loaded with volunteers left Scottsboro on the morning of the runoff. They went into cotton fields and took the farmers' pick-ups and continued to fill them while the voters were driven to the polls to vote for Judge Jones.

At headquarters in Scottsboro, about a dozen young women spent the day calling almost everyone in the county who had a telephone and urging them to go vote.

The result was summed up by an eight-column headline across the front page of *The Times* Oct. 23, 1946—"Bob Jones Sweeps District."

For all practical purposes, Jones was the new Eighth District congressman but he had to go through the motions of running, unopposed, in a general election Jan. 28, 1947. On that date, at the age of 34, he became the Tennessee Valley section of Alabama's congressional delegation—the job he has now held for 25 years. Today he ranks 30th in

seniority among the 435 members of the House.

Nationally, the congressional elections of 1946 took on an aspect not seen in American politics for many years. The millions of World War II veterans were back at home and taking an active part in politics. It was largely this support, particularly in Jackson County, that put Jones in office.

When he took his seat shortly after the 80th Congress convened, Jones became the first congressman from Jackson County since Williamson R. W. Cobb of Bellefonte resigned in 1861, shortly before Alabama left the Union.

Three men who have since gained great national prominence were also elected to Congress in 1946.

While Jones, a Navy veteran who had served on Gen. Douglas MacArthur's legal staff, was campaigning in North Alabama, another young Navy veteran was winning on the campaign trail in his home state of Massachusetts. And when Jones came to Washington he was assigned an office next to this fellow freshman congressman, John F. Kennedy. The New Englander and Southerner became good friends.

After President Kennedy's death in 1963, it was Jones who sponsored legislation creating a national cultural center in Washington as the official national memorial to him. The bill established the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, which opened last year.

Other new representatives in the 80th Congress included Richard M. Nixon of California and Carl Albert of Oklahoma, now speaker of the House.

During his first campaign, Jones emphasized three promises to the voters through his leaflets and posters and in his speeches.

He said he was for "enlightened legislation to increase the purchasing power of the farmer and to protect his markets; low-cost long-term financing for farm homes; and expansion of the Tennessee Valley Authority to its fullest capacity and the extension of the Rural Electrification program to assure every farm home in the Eighth District the benefit of cheap electricity."

He has kept those promises over the last quarter of a century, his record shows.

During his first 10 years in office, much of the congressman's time was spent defending TVA against its opponents in the House and fighting for increased cotton allotments and better support prices for the farmers of his district.

He was the author of the Rural Housing Act which provides loans from the Farmers Home Administration for new farm homes. The first of these loans was given to a Jackson County farmer in 1949.

Today, there is probably not a farm home in the Eighth District that does not have electricity available.

Jones earned the honorary title of "Mr. TVA" in his battles to preserve that agency during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations.

His voting record on TVA legislation is unvarying. In 1959 he sponsored legislation authorizing TVA to borrow up to \$1 billion to finance its power expansion programs, finally making the agency free of congressional financial control in its power program. Four years ago he introduced and secured passage of legislation increasing the bonding authority to \$5 billion.

In his early years in the House, Representative Jones could not spend all his time worrying about the problems of his district, however. His first committee assignment was to the House District of Columbia Committee.

At that time, Washington had no mayor or city government and was run by the congressional committee. So, soon after arriving in Washington, the former county judge from rural Alabama found himself grappling with the problems of one of the most complex and cosmopolitan cities in the world.

Over the years, his committee assignments have changed and he has long since been off the District Committee but later, as chairman of Public Buildings and Grounds Subcommittee, he oversaw a vast construction program of new federal buildings in Washington.

While the congressman has devoted much time to many issues, there is one area, above all others, that has consistently drawn his attention and one in which he is a recognized national expert. That is flood control and water pollution.

He served as chairman of the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee which conducted America's most comprehensive examination of national water resources, including anti-pollution measures during the first half of the 1960s—long before "ecology" became a household word.

In 1965 he assumed the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Flood Control and Internal Development of the Public Works Committee. He remains in that position today and is the ranking Democrat on the full Public Works Committee.

In the Flood Control Subcommittee, he handles waterway development legislation for the entire nation, including the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal—a project he has been advocating ever since he entered Congress.

His work on such matters as flood control and rural housing have earned Congressman Jones the label of "Southern liberal." After his first year in office, national newspaper columnist Drew Pearson picked him as one of the 10 best new members.

The Americans for Democratic Action rated Jones' voting record in 1960 at 90 out of a possible 100. Among Southern congressmen and senators, that was second only to Sens. Estes Kefauver of Tennessee.

His liberal voting record has been fairly consistent except for one issue—civil rights. In that area he has generally voted with other Southerners in opposition to proposed legislation, beginning with President Truman's civil rights amendments in 1948.

At that time he was quoted in various newspapers in the district as saying, "I shall vigorously oppose all measures which would affect the way of life in the South. I mean the FEPC (Fair Employment Practices Commission), anti-poll tax proposals, and especially any measure which would impose on the people of Alabama any dictation from the federal government on how to carry on their normal way of life."

Even on the civil rights question, he is not inflexible, however. Last year he voted for an extension of the Civil Rights Act because it was attached to the 18-year-old vote amendment. He was in favor of lowering the voting age, and the Civil Rights Act was assured of being extended anyway, so he says he saw no reason to oppose a measure he favored just to cast a ceremonial vote against civil rights.

Throughout his 25 years in Congress, Jones has retained some basic political philosophy. First and foremost is his belief in building. He sums it up in talking about his years on the Public Works Committee.

"I had rather build monuments of public accommodation such as schools and highways and sewer systems than to sit here dole and fret away with the phantoms of hate."

In his position as chairman of various "building" subcommittees, Jones could have had public buildings and locks or dams all over the country named for him if he had wished. But he has steadfastly refused to allow a single public structure to be dedicated to him, according to his staff.

Last week, however, he spent his first day back in Washington after the recess working to name the Columbia dam in South Alabama for his longtime friend, the late Rep. George W. Andrews of Union Springs who died last month.

Although nothing in the Eighth District or anywhere else bears his name, his staff claims that you can drive the entire length of the Eighth District from the Georgia state line to Mississippi and never be out of sight of something that their boss was responsible for building.

Congressman Jones will not single out any particular public works legislation which he has sponsored which he feels has contributed more to the nation than any other. He does feel, however, that the \$27-million water pollution control bill, which he guided through the Public Works Committee when he was acting chairman just before Christmas, will be the legislation that will finally eliminate water pollution in the United States—a goal he has been working toward since the early 1960s.

For his own district and the surrounding area, he feels his TVA self-financing bills were extremely important.

"There is no doubt in my mind that TVA would have been liquidated in another 18 months if we had not gotten the first finance act through in 1959, because the Eisenhower administration simply would not budget any money for power expansion," he said.

He does not claim credit for singlehandedly saving TVA. Other Tennessee Valley congressmen and senators also worked hard for the agency but the North Alabamian's efforts were sufficient to earn him the honorary title of "Mr. TVA"—one which he is very proud of.

Another monument to Jones and other members of the public works committee is the Interstate Highway System—the largest public works project in the history of the world.

Jones led the fight against an Eisenhower administration proposal in 1955 to finance the Interstate system through the sale of bonds. He was successful and the next year the Public Works Committee put through a pay-as-you-go Interstate plan. This, according to the congressman, has saved billions of dollars in interest payments.

As he begins his 26th year in Congress, Jones has no plans to retire anytime soon. He will announce that he is a candidate for re-election for a 14th term within the next two weeks.

Asked about retirement plans, the 59-year-old legislator's only comment was, "I haven't applied for my old-age pension yet."

The congressman does not claim to have succeeded alone, however, in his career as lawmaker. He gives much of the credit to his staff which he calls "the best on Capitol Hill."

But most of the credit belongs to the people of the Eighth District, he says. "I appreciate more than I can ever express the fact that they have permitted me to represent them all these years. They have been generous and sometimes maybe excessive in overlooking my legislative faults," he says of the voters of North Alabama.

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

**HON. JOHN E. HUNT**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, in the words of our colleague from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE):

A child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

Sadly and regretfully, however, some people have manipulated these words and seem disposed to perpetuate the inhumane treatment of our American POW's by supporting the North Vietnamese propaganda. It is now quite clear that the setting of a definite date for the withdrawal of American troops was not the only condition for the release of our American POW's and it should be equally clear that the agony of their position as pawns will be perpetuated for as long as those vociferous elements among us are duped into parroting the Communist line. "How long?"

#### DR. KRAUSS CITED FOR SERVICE TO ALLEGHENY COUNTY

**HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding advocates of citizen participation and citizen action in western Pennsylvania, Dr. Martin Krauss, was honored by the county commissioners of Allegheny County recently for his contributions to the community.

Dr. Krauss' activities in behalf of the blind and in the area of sight conservation are only one side of this energetic man.

HEART, a citizens group on Pittsburgh's northside, is Dr. Krauss' creation. Dedicated to getting a fair shake for citizens whose property is in the path of a new interstate highway, Dr. Krauss and HEART have been crusading for local residents for almost 3 years. Many of the increased property settlements and other considerations wrung from the State and Federal officials have resulted from the efforts of HEART members.

I am pleased to add my congratulations and thanks to Dr. Martin Krauss.

I would like to include at this time a copy of a resolution passed by the Allegheny County Commissioners and a press release of the Krauss ceremonies:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY

Whereas, a man attains in the measure that he aspires, and gains respect to his fellow man whom he selflessly serves; and

Whereas, Allegheny County is endowed with such a man with an accumulation of energy, enthusiasm and hope for mankind; and

Whereas, the Pennsylvania Optometric Association has named Dr. Martin Krauss as Optometrist of the year for 1971, and nominated him for American Optometrist of the year; and

Whereas, Dr. Krauss serves as vice chairman of the Allegheny County Board of Health, and has served the citizens of Allegheny County as health chairman of the Office of Economic Opportunity; and

Whereas, the community has benefited through his services as chairman of the Pittsburgh Neighborhood Alliance Health Committee, as president of the Lions Community Services, and as chairman of sight conservation and work for the blind with Lions International District 14-B, bringing to the citizens of Pennsylvania the finest visual welfare; and

Whereas, under his direction the Lions

Community Services acquired an Eyemobile from the Vision Conservation Institute for free vision screening throughout Allegheny County, and maintains it through funds raised at the annual Eye Bowl football game which he helped originate; and

Whereas, Dr. Krauss complements his health contributions with civic enterprise as President of the Highway Emergency and Relocation Team, known widely as "Heart", which seeks equality and justice for persons surrendering their homes and businesses to make way for a new highway and progress; and

Whereas, throughout all his endeavors, Dr. Krauss has sought with fervor the well-being and touch of happiness to the many less fortunate and those in need of various types of assistance.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that this Board of County Commissioners does hereby congratulate Dr. Krauss on the honor bestowed upon him by his colleagues, and for his fidelity and distinguished service to the citizens of Allegheny County.

#### PRESS RELEASE

In special ceremonies in the County Court House, Commissioners Leonard C. Stalsey and Thomas J. Foerster cited Dr. Krauss "for his fidelity and distinguished service to the citizens of Allegheny County."

They pointed out Dr. Krauss' voluminous contributions to this area not only in sight conservation and work for the blind in behalf of Lions International, but also his civic involvement in behalf of Northside Pittsburgh businessmen and especially the Highway Emergency and Relocation Team (HEART).

Commissioner Stalsey said many people talk about participating in community affairs, but Dr. Krauss went beyond talk and acted. He said that although Dr. Krauss lives in Squirrel Hill, he came to the aid of many persons including youngsters who could not afford glasses on the Northside where he has maintained his office for more than 30 years.

Commissioner Foerster praised Dr. Krauss for serving on the County Board of Health. The Commissioners said HEART's guidelines in providing fair and equitable sums for relocating with persons whose property was needed in expansion of the Greater Pittsburgh International Airport.

Mr. Foerster, a fellow-member of Northside Pittsburgh Lions Club, recalled how he and Dr. Krauss were co-founders of the annual Eye Bowl game which raises funds for free eye examinations for the needy in the County. Dr. Krauss told the Commissioners that the Lions Community Services now has funds to purchase a second Eyemobile next year.

The resolution pointed out that Dr. Krauss has served as health chairman of the Office of Economic Opportunity in the County, chairman of the Pittsburgh Neighborhood Alliance Health Committee and "throughout all his endeavors, has sought with fervor the well-being and touch of happiness to the many less fortunate and those in need of various types of assistance."

#### SOME A, B, C's OF THE PRESIDENT'S WAR ON INFLATION

**HON. GERALD R. FORD**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the January edition of the American Legion magazine contains an excellent article on inflation and phase II of the

President's program to control it. The authors of the article are Haig Babian, an economist, and Peter D. Bolter. They have taken the complicated subject of inflation and explained it in simple language. I recommend a reading of this article to all of my colleagues. The article follows:

SOME A, B, C'S OF THE PRESIDENT'S WAR ON INFLATION

(By Haig Babian and Peter D. Bolter)

There are those who say they are confused by what are called President Nixon's wage-price controls and the Administration's policies on foreign trade and the dollar—all of which you might call our sudden "all-out war on inflation."

Of course, there's confusion. The mere situation is so involved that the first guy who says it's all clear to him should have his head examined.

We're dealing with nothing less than an effort across the whole sweep of our economy, here and abroad, to arrest a trend of more than 30 years of bad habits in which the cost of everything has been merrily rising. No effort to arrest it all at once could be simple or tackled without confusion. Most of our normal bread-and-butter activities are affected. The inflation problem, figuratively speaking, has a thousand heads and ten thousand tails. The solution may have more.

Consider how long the list is of only the more familiar facets of the problem.

Here at home, everyone has tried to meet his own increases in costs by charging more for what he does. Then everyone else charged him more then he charged everyone else more, then they charged him more... without end.

Individually, everyone was more or less justified. If you are charged more you have to charge more.

Collectively, it has all been nonsense and increasingly more dangerous to the welfare of each and all of us.

Little has been—or could be—gained by getting more while paying more at the same time. Just that much of our inflation has had us on a treadmill.

Meanwhile, this process that has gained us very little has made our savings and retirement benefits shrink in value while it has made it ever riskier for new businesses to open or for old ones to expand, or even to order more goods than absolutely necessary.

New investments could lose their value too fast as the dollars tied up in them lost value to inflation. They had to earn more and more in order to be worth the risk of investing. The money tied up in goods has shrunk in value as the goods sat on shelves or in warehouses, unless their prices were constantly hiked. Just this much made it inevitable that either the inflation would go through the roof or there'd come a day of less work and less real income for Americans in general—an ultimate recession or even a depression. But more.

As our prices soared, it became cheaper to import many goods than to buy American.

As our wages soared, it became cheaper to move all or part of some of our business abroad.

The rising prices of our goods made them harder to sell abroad, and harder to sell here in competition with foreign imports.

For decades we supported a false, high value for our dollar abroad which—as we shall see—made it even harder to sell our goods overseas or compete with imports here.

We've been taxing ourselves to send money abroad for foreign aid or military expenditures—less and less of which returned when our ability declined to sell goods abroad and thus bring it back as profits from foreign trade.

There's nothing simple about this familiar web of evils. It would be amazing if an effort to untangle it all at once—after 30 years of

ingrained bad habits—weren't endlessly complicated.

The President and Congress thought about imposing controls for a long time before they acted. In 1970, Congress finally passed a law giving the President the basic powers he's now using. He thought them over another year before acting. Then he imposed a 90-day freeze (Phase 1) to give him and all the assistants at his command time to work out the next step of the controls (what's now called Phase 2).

If they needed 90 days more after years of thought, those of us on the outside shouldn't make too much of a point of how simple it isn't. You can't clarify it all in a paragraph. The main pieces make more sense if they are put in some sort of order and looked at one at a time.

The broadest question of all is: Why controls now, after so many years of getting by without them in spite of earlier inflation?

The simplest answer is that all of our years of inflation finally reached the stage of acute national danger in 1970-71. Then, political enemies came together, at least temporarily, as they recognized that the disaster point had been reached. A Democratic Congress gave a Republican President huge powers to act in 1970, at a time when he was still reluctant to use them. That couldn't happen in American politics unless those in the know saw that the inflation thing was coming to an intolerable crisis. Democrats don't normally force vast powers on unwilling Republicans. The President, who hadn't wanted to use such powers and hadn't asked for them, reversed himself within a year.

Economic rivals came together in the same way. Labor and management (as well as conservative and liberal economists who could agree on little else) have always shuddered at the thought of federal controls of prices and wages. Yet, before the President acted, leaders in all three camps had come out for controls. In the 1970's, though not before, inflation in the United States had finally reached the point where there was almost universal agreement that emergency action was needed on a broad scale.

Almost everything else had been tried piecemeal. Taxes had been raised to cure our ills—and lowered. Interest rates had been raised—and lowered. Labor and management had been asked to follow "guidelines" in setting wages and prices. Steps had been taken to protect the gold dollar overseas, with other nations cooperating. Friendly efforts to limit imports had been tried, and unfriendly quotas had been set on some imports. Result? Our inflation only got worse. In the 1970's, nothing but major surgery was left—an assault on inflation right across the board of our economy.

We've heard the experts say that the "inflation rate" has reached 6% annually, and that one goal of our crash program is to get it down to about 2%.

If you aren't an economist, it isn't easy to appreciate what 6% annual inflation means as compared to 2%. Hardly anything in our economy has been rising in cost that fast for any appreciable time. But there is one item around that has averaged 6% inflation for the last 35 years. What happened to it is a pretty chilling example of what 6% annual inflation means when it applies to almost everything.

In some metropolitan areas, nice six-room houses on nice lots that sold for \$6,000 in 1937 went for about \$45,000 in 1971. That comes almost exactly to a yearly average of 6% inflation of the prices of such houses for 35 years.

If they keep rising at 6% annually those houses will sell for over \$104,000 in 1986! The one-year increase in 1987 would then exceed the \$6,000 cost back in 1937.

These particular suburban houses have been exceptional—over the years perhaps our most inflated item. Nobody claimed that their

fate was a national catastrophe. But when the national annual inflation rate recently hit 6%, it meant that, on the average, every product and service in the country was starting to go the same way!

At that rate, the average price of everything would more than double in 12 years. Then, if we each managed to double our incomes in 12 years we'd have slipped behind a little. Meanwhile, the value of our retirement benefits and savings would suffer serious loss.

Consider what happens to retirement income. Under 2% inflation, if you retire at 65 you'll find that when you are 75 it would take \$121.89 to buy what \$100 bought when you retired. That's bad enough, but...

Under 6% annual inflation it would take \$178.83 at age 75 to buy what \$100 bought ten years earlier. This isn't hardship, it's disaster for people whose chance to earn the difference is nil. At age 77, the buying power of the retirement dollar shrinks to less than half of what it was at 65.

Small wonder that many working members of labor unions have said publicly that they could forego large wage increases if the inflation rate could be brought back down. There's little to gain from wages that rise when prices rise too. But there's much to lose when the same trend is almost a death blow to the retirement incomes that many union members have built up through years of effort. It's just as bad for savings and investments.

If you put \$100 in a savings account and let it sit there at 4% interest for three years, the interest will bring the balance up to \$112.49. But what is its value?

If inflation has been at the 2% rate, your savings account, after three years, will have the buying power that \$106.12 had when you first deposited the \$100. The inflation will do you out of the real value of about half your interest, but you still make money.

At 6% annual inflation, you lose. The \$112.49 balance after three years will only have the buying power that a little over \$92 had when you first deposited the \$100. (Of course, the loss is even greater if you put the \$100 in a teakettle without interest.)

No wonder that, even though we now hear them quarreling over who's bearing most of the burden of the new controls, our economic and political opponents came together on the need for major surgery for the whole economy when the inflation rate hit 6%.

It's bad enough that savings—which are "extra" money—are a losing proposition at usual interest rates. But the same process undermines the investments on which people, businesses and the nation depend for a living.

What does happen to businesses that keep employment and trade booming when investments are so chewed into by inflation that to earn 4 percent a year on them can result in a net loss of 8 percent of their true value in three years? The answer is all around us.

Next businesses become scarce as the investment in them has to earn ever more just to break even. Old companies stop investing in expansion or even in keeping their plants up to date. Their employees feel cutbacks. There's less work for those who'd normally provide expansion and maintenance operations. Businessmen and investors—large and small—get out of bread-and-butter activities and look for opportunities that have a chance of big paper profits in order to make small real profits. Some seek better conditions for their plants or their investments abroad. And who can blame them if the alternative is steady erosion under unchecked American inflation?

All of the above has been said to establish two things in somewhat plainer language than the experts use.

(1) American inflation in the 1970's finally reached the point where drastic action became urgent beyond all question.

(2) The confusion in the early days of figuring out and applying controls is unavoidable. The situation is too complex to arrest the trend and start a better one with any simple remedy. The simple ones have all failed.

One of the few things that is simple is that our new economic program has two main parts and only two.

(1) to arrest the inflationary spiral in the United States.

(2) To remove from our foreign dealings certain artificial elements that have increasingly worked to our disadvantage as our situation at home got worse.

Checking our own inflation will be the more complicated of the two. It must deal with thousands of details and a host of conflicting interests.

The foreign trade problem is quite different in its nature.

Only a few years ago we sold \$7 billion more in goods abroad than we bought from overseas. In 1971, that advantage had disappeared, chiefly because of the rising flood of imports here. Some argue that trade between nations can be healthy if it just about balances, as ours did in 1971. But if we seek no more than a balance, it must be a balance of the total flow of money back and forth, rather than of the single item of trade. In our case, we send money overseas for such things as foreign and military aid—and our people spend more on tourism—for which nothing comes back unless our trade balance is favorable enough to recapture it. Thus, we must restore the favorable balance of trade in goods that has now vanished, if only to keep our substance from draining away in non-trade items whose flow is out of our country.

Our present foreign trade inequities trace back to the end of WW2. Most of our friends (and former enemies) were then prostrate. We had (and still have) the most vigorous and productive economic system in the world, and we were untouched by the physical damage of the war. We deliberately built up other nations' trade and industry, and shared largely in their defense. As long as they needed it, this was good for them and good for us. Having healthy nations to trade with was and continues to be a need of our own.

But, as President Nixon said last summer, most of them are back on their feet. Many nations have been doing better than we have, at our expense. It was time, the President said, to reconsider old favors and compete with them on a more equal footing. The same feeling ran through the Senate when it recently threatened to end all foreign aid. Our own worsening inflation had even given other nations advantages beyond what we'd ever intended. In the shape we were in, these had to be arrested.

For this reason, the President imposed a temporary 10% tax on many imports last summer, as a stopgap measure until the effect of more durable arrangements could be felt.

In the long run, import taxes don't solve too many foreign trade problems. The other nations simply retaliate with taxes against our exports. Like the freeze, the 10% import tax was a shock treatment to arrest a trend and to make it clear that the United States means business in putting its economy on a sounder basis.

More importantly, the President took the dollar off the gold standard abroad. A lot of mystery surrounds the average man's understanding of the hocus-pocus of the overseas American gold dollar, but it isn't all that mysterious.

The basic fact is that we've had two different dollars—the paper dollar at home and the gold dollar abroad. The dollar at home has not been redeemable in gold since Franklin Roosevelt's time. By putting a paper dollar in the hands of a foreign owner it became a gold dollar. In the years since WW2, the inflated paper dollar here has sunk fur-

ther and further below the fixed value of the American-guaranteed gold dollar abroad.

Look what that did for importers who sold their goods here in competition with American business. If the Japanese could make a car cheaper than Detroit can because of lower manufacturing costs, they could sell it here *even cheaper yet*. The paper dollars they got for it from American customers became gold dollars when taken out of the country. Thus, they could undersell Detroit in America not only by the difference in actual costs, but by the margin that their paper dollars increased in value when swapped as gold dollars for yens in Japan. Tricky? So tricky that our own businessmen and investors who have done the same arithmetic have moved many operations overseas in order to compete not only in actual costs but in the two-value dollar market.

We maintained the gold dollar overseas right after WW2 as a favor to all nations. They needed a stable currency in international trade that none of the rest of them could furnish.

When President Nixon abolished the gold overseas dollar in August, he wiped out an artificial aid to foreign competition that had become especially painful to American workers who can't move overseas as readily as businesses and investment can. The overseas dollar will now "float." It will find its natural value in relation to the yen or the mark and lose its false high value. It will tend to approach the same value as the paper dollar at home. Abolishing the gold dollar will also make it easier for us to sell what we make overseas. The yen, the mark, the pound and the franc will now buy more in the United States, as they are worth more in paper dollars than in gold dollars.

Our economic system is inherently so strong that, with such artificial disadvantages removed, we should bounce back in our power to compete with foreign products here and abroad.

The 10% import tax can probably be done away with after a while. But the effect of removing artificial advantages for foreign goods will take time, and it will even be painful for many Americans until a new balance is struck.

American firms which import what they sell here, or which import parts, will be hurt until a slower swing to manufacture the same things competitively in America occurs. There *will* be a new balance, and we *will* be importing less and exporting more. The change in the dollar assures such a slow trend. The 10% import tax hurries it along. In the long run, that will give both American business and labor a boost in spite of short-term pains.

This much plus the whittling of U.S. foreign aid, is the main drift of the President's program to check the adverse effect of arbitrary foreign trade advantages on our economy.

The aim, after an unsettling period of breaking entrenched habits, is to strike a more natural balance of international competition—which would be better for American business and wage earners.

American consumers will not benefit *price-wise* from the foreign part of the program. Imports will cost more than we have been accustomed to pay for them. Advantages must come from stepped up American earnings and employment.

So we come to the home front where the aim is to hold prices of American goods in check. It's plain that everybody understands the broad aims of our controls on wages and prices here.

Most Americans seem to be ready for someone to stop the process of everybody demanding more from everybody else and repeating it endlessly to the detriment of all and the good of none. We are thoroughly sick and frightened of inflation.

We know that the controls are an effort to put a damper on inflation by bringing government intervention to bear on both sides when labor and management start agreeing to hike things and pass the cost along.

What bugs most people is not the purpose of the controls, but how they can be made to work fairly; how permanent they will be; when, if ever, the program will level off to something that's "normal," and whether or not the controls, as they are now shaping up, will work as they're supposed to.

One of the first cries of "unfairness" was that business was getting a better deal than labor when the first controls were announced. Then, when it was announced that labor would be allowed to increase wages at a higher rate than business could raise prices, the squawks ran the other way.

A lot of this talk is just par for the course. We got inflation because everyone naturally wants more for himself than the other guy gets. The controls haven't changed human nature, but they are trying to curb it a bit.

Business was given tax breaks on money it would invest in expansion and other forms of growth. It gets "investment credits" on what it puts into improvements when it comes to figuring tax deductions. But *restrictions* on business also try to encourage it to invest more in growth. The brakes were put on dividend hikes for shareholders in big companies—which should result in profits being invested more readily in growth. The President promised that "windfall profits" would suffer penalties.

Thus, price controls weren't the only restrictions put on business or investors. If they are successfully prodded to turn more of their earnings into growth, that should spur trade and employment. The President and his aides are betting that such growth could pay for the permitted wage increases out of real earnings instead of out of inflation. And that's the only way we can all make real gains in our living standards.

Such steps are urgent. American business, as we've seen, has been persuaded by inflation to spend relatively less on expansion and new developments. That's one of the main reasons why other countries have passed us in some fields where we were once supreme.

But nobody would claim that the first controls were all "fair." They *seemed* to be fair generally, but a system of review boards was set up to hear complaints of unfairness and try to figure out who was just jawing and whose claim had merit.

It would be impossible for the first controls to have been fair to everyone. At the time the freeze went on, some wages and prices had just been boosted, while others were overdue. It will plainly take months to sort out the justice and the injustice of applying the controls, in each case, to individual situations as they were at the moment of the freeze.

The board's work won't be made easier by claims that lack merit. Nevertheless, it was heartening to note that General Motors and its appliance workers at Frigidaire announced a deal on Nov. 21 whereby the electrical workers gave up raises to which they were entitled, while GM lowered some prices and agreed to hire back many workers who'd been laid off. More of this is guaranteed to lick inflation.

There was considerable concern early this winter about when the situation will "level off." In November, the whole business world was plagued with a feeling of uncertainty. Many companies postponed commitments that have to be made to keep the wheels turning. This uncertainty should be short-lived. Most of it is caused by the pains of the changeover to controls. When the various control boards have settled most of the

claims of special consideration that they've been wrestling with, we should arrive at a "normal" situation. About the only thing that could then keep the uncertainty alive would be decisions by powerful elements in labor, management or policies to try to buck the controls. If that happens, we may be in for a long period of chaos.

Nobody knows how long the controls will last. If they can get our economy back on the track, they may quickly be replaced by some gentler form of restraint on a permanent or standby basis, lest in the future we go back to the recklessness of the recent past when everyone took all he could get and passed the cost along. If the inflation and recession are not checked, we may need tougher controls.

The present controls are ingeniously devised not to be permanent. The President has created a combination of official, semi-official and voluntary boards to run things in the loosest possible way. It is about the minimum use of the powers Congress voted to give him in 1970. It can all be disbanded with little strain or pain the moment it isn't needed. This easily disposable machinery offers a strong inducement for those who are chafing at the controls to use more voluntary restraint. The sooner the job is done, the sooner the controls can be relaxed.

We noted earlier that until things got so bad, *nobody* wanted government controls of wages and prices. Of course, labor and management would both rather be free to shoot for all they can get, since that's the nature of the human animal. But leading economists, who are divided into conservative and liberal camps like most other people, were also dead set against controls until very recently.

Just a few years ago, a group of economists held a seminar which some of the most liberal and the most conservative attended. Among them, they could agree on very little. But to a man they then opposed government wage-price controls, and for the same reasons. It is impossible, they said, for bureaucrats in government to fairly judge what everyone who's working for a living in this country should get. They might be able temporarily to arrest a bad situation, given the power. But as time went by dictatorial power to set wages and prices would become more arbitrary. Favors and graft would creep in, and black markets would grow. Business would become less imaginative and more fearful of taking risks if it needed a bureaucratic stamp on everything it was willing to gamble on. These evils had crept into our wartime controls in the past. It was an excess of controls (that were once needed) that helped get our railroads into their present sorry state. Government controls in the hands of the dictators have a history of cramping the growth of their economies.

Nobody has changed his mind about all that. The universal dislike of rigid controls helps explain why, when something *had* to be done, the result was such a peculiar mixture of government power tempered by appeals for voluntary restraint.

It explains why the President's controlling boards are such a mixture of officials, "public members" serving voluntarily, and representatives of labor and business. Everything has been done to prevent creating a permanent wage-price control bureaucracy, and to bring as little official power to bear as possible, while still using enough to persuade.

It explains why so much of "Phase 2" set firm guidelines for the more powerful corporations and unions, but just hoped that the smaller ones would fall in line without the government rubber-stamping everything they might want to do.

The whole setup is about as far a cry from having a Commissar of Business and Labor as you can get while still trying to put official brakes on a runaway situation.

For those who are asking "Will the President's program work?" the better question is "Will *our* program work?" It is not devised to work without a maximum of cooperation in the world of business, labor and politics.

Your two authors have a sneaking suspicion that it will work. While the news media have naturally been playing up the early changeover difficulties, the complaints and the threats of the noncooperative, we think we sense a general determination in the land to make it work. Most people today recognize that our inflation is no longer something we can tolerate.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION— OCTOBER 12, 1971

### HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, a most serious and critical situation is developing within American higher education today. The reduction and suspension of vitally needed financial support to scholarship and fellowship foundations is causing undue hardship among this Nation's graduate students. I was shocked to read recently in the New York Times of the postponement of the prestigious Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship competition for 1972-73. Federally supported graduate fellowships in the United States have declined from 10,975 in 1967 to an estimated 1,570 for 1972—a decrease of more than 80 percent. Many fellowship programs supported by State governments have similarly been reduced. For example, the State of New York has recently announced cancellation of its Herbert H. Lehman Fellowships and its Regents fellowship programs which in recent years provided approximately 450 grants a year. Similarly, the State of California has announced cancellation of programs which had provided some 900 graduate fellowships a year. The Office of Education announced that no new N.D.E.A. graduate fellows would be added to the federally sponsored program. Among private fellowship programs the largest in 1967 was that of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation which between 1957 and 1967 supported approximately 1,000 students each year. In 1971 it is supporting only 230 students. Other smaller private fellowship programs have reduced the number of students they support, and some such as the Presbyterian Graduate Fellowships have been canceled entirely. Universities report that the phasing out of such Federal programs as N.D.E.A. and NSF traineeships have not been offset by additional funds provided by the university.

Mr. Speaker, this situation cannot continue. The cost of a graduate education is estimated, conservatively, at more than \$5,000 a year. Graduate students, many of whom work full time, are married and struggling to make ends meet, have to burden themselves with thousands of dollars in loans to meet the growing cost of attaining a higher degree. The suspension of the well-known Woodrow Wilson Fellowships represents

a retrogression, which we in the Congress should not allow to continue. I insert the New York Times article, "Awards Halted By Wilson Fund" of September 10 and the New York Times editorial on the suspension, entitled "Moratorium on Excellence."

The articles follow:

AWARDS HALTED BY WILSON FUND—SHORTAGE OF MONEY BLAMED IN FOUNDATION'S ENDING OF TEACHER EDUCATION AID

WASHINGTON.—Competition for the prestigious Woodrow Wilson Fellowships has been suspended for at least a year because of a lack of funds.

H. Ronald Rouse, national director of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation in Princeton, N. J., confirmed today that the foundation decided June 30 to suspend the competition for next year's college graduates. The fellowships are designed to provide first-year support of graduate students who plan to go into college teaching.

"We are quite determined and hopeful that we can get going again," said Dr. Hans Rosenhaupt, president of the foundation.

Mr. Rouse said, "This is going to be a year of soul-searching and self study for us. We are looking at the alternatives and at the other needs of society that should be filled."

"The Woodrow Wilson program was an extremely important symbol to higher education, with much more value than its material contributions," said Martin Meyers, president of the University of Pennsylvania who is chairman of the American Assembly's study group on the goals of university governance. "It is a terrible tragedy in that, a few years of this kind of practice, of lack of support, will soon mean a sudden break in the production of new scholars, even in terms of the demands of the next five years."

"If there is not a sustained flow of new scholars, researchers, and professors, we may easily undermine all the advances that it has taken us a generation to build."

This year more than 8,000 college seniors applied for the 305 fellowships awarded to those entering graduate school this fall. Of the 305 fellows, 85 received financial support from other foundations or the Government, with the Wilson foundation providing a \$2,000 stipend and a \$1,000 tuition award for each of the others. A total of 220 getting financial support from the foundation also received scholarships from their graduate schools for tuition not covered by the \$1,000 grant.

The fellowships were established in 1945 as a Princeton University program.

The program continued to be centered at Princeton until the early nineteen-fifties, when the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the General Education Board provided financial support for more than 100 national awards a year. The fellowships were then administered by the American Association of Universities.

In 1957 the Ford Foundation gave the program \$24.5 million for five years. The Wilson Foundation, set up that year to handle the greatly expanded program, received a second five-year Ford grant of \$27.5-million in 1962.

In the decade of support of the fellowships by the Ford Foundation, more than 1,300 fellows were named annually, with about 1,000 receiving financial support. The fellowships then provided full tuition awards, as well as a stipend of \$1,500, plus family allowances.

In 1967, however, the Ford Foundation decided not to renew its support.

"There isn't the slightest question that the program is immensely successful and useful," said Mrs. Marjorie Chamberlain, program officer in higher education for Ford. "However, we changed our focus at that time, setting up grants of about \$500,000 a year to 10 major universities in an effort both to look for ways to shorten the time of

graduate study and to produce more scholars in the social sciences and the humanities."

From 1967 to 1970 the Wilson Foundation awarded an average of 1,000 fellowships a year, but provided financial support to only 150 a year.

"This was the time of massive support of graduate programs by the Government," Mr. Rouse noted, "and we were able to get other groups, such as the Avalon foundation, the Old Dominion Foundation and the Merrill Trust to provide limited funds. In addition, the Ford Foundation gave us an average of \$1.5-million annually during these three years to cover administrative expenses."

"We have to get away from this boom-bust philosophy that has us swinging from a deficit to a surplus," Dr. Rosenhaupt said.

#### MORATORIUM ON EXCELLENCE

The suspension for at least one year of the annual competition for Woodrow Wilson Fellowships represents a dismaying new entry on the higher education's financial fever chart. These grants have constituted one of the most successful devices for the identification and training of high-quality college teachers. That funds have dried up, even if perhaps only temporarily, signifies a deplorable lack of foresight by those foundations that have kept the fellowship competition alive since the Ford Foundation terminated most of its original support in 1967.

Undoubtedly, the decision can be rationalized on the basis that the earlier scarcity of faculty members has now turned into a surplus, thus making the subsidy of any teacher-training program a matter of low priority. But such reasoning confuses questions of quantity and quality. Even in a period of oversupply, the continuing need to seek out and encourage outstanding teaching potential cannot safely be ignored. The Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation's concern with excellence is scarcely obsolete. To turn funds off now dries up an invaluable source of future talent.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hans Rosenhaupt, the president of the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation recently wrote an article entitled "Glut or Bonanza?" I feel that his remarks best answer those critics of the graduate programs who claim that there is a "Ph. D. glut" in American education. I wish also to insert Dr. Rosenhaupt's remarks:

#### GLUT OR BONANZA?

Recent news about the temporary suspension of Woodrow Wilson fellowships for first year graduate students in 1972-1973 raises the question "why hasn't adequate support for these fellowships been found?" One important reason is that foundation and corporation officials whom we approach for help have been unduly impressed by accounts of the current "Ph. D. Glut." I believe one that there is no severe glut; two, that highly trained young men and women are a national asset; three, that relatively small changes in our economy of brains will more than take care of any current or future surplus of Ph. D.'s.

While it is true that today young Ph. D.'s like almost everybody else, have trouble being placed, most end up with jobs. Of last year's 890 Ph.D.'s produced by the University of Wisconsin, only ten were unemployed in March 1971, and an additional 53 seeking jobs in Academe ended up in jobs outside Academe. It is more than likely that this year's "glut" will affect a similarly modest percentage of the total new Ph.D.'s, at the most an estimated two thousand altogether, certainly less than ten per cent of the annual total 30 or 35 thousand produced. Typically surplus Ph. D.'s are concentrated in a few fields such as Physics, where government and industry cut-backs aggravate the situation.

In March 1971, only 10 of Wisconsin's 106 graduate departments and programs reported "a severe surplus situation." (*Change Magazine*, Summer 1971, page 21.)

Since vigorous young Academics tend to make many applications, some prospective employers of Ph.D.'s have received several hundred applications for a single opening, thus furnishing ammunition to all the "I told you so" Cassandras. Frequently prophets of doom are economists, who know much about the market and little about the human animal and its ability to make changes. Looked at in historical perspective, a surplus of highly trained young men and women is a natural stage in our civilization's movement toward more and better services. As fewer people are needed to make our goods, more will be available to render services as doctors, teachers, lawyers, and also, let us hope, as repairmen. Today's "Ph.D. Glut" can become a bonanza for education all the way from secondary education to post-doctoral research, quite aside from benefits to non-academic employers.

Prospects for making greater use of Ph.D.'s in higher education are good. During the next five years, new faculty appointments for replacement and growth should number about 20,000 annually. Industrial and faculty cutbacks may change the picture some, but supply and demand should be roughly in balance—with a possible Ph.D. surplus every year of a few thousand. This surplus could be easily absorbed if colleges and universities were to return to the teacher-student ratio of 1 to 13 of ten years ago—it has deteriorated to 1 to 15.6 (and that figure may have more bearing on student dissatisfaction than we realize). Return to the earlier ratio would require more than 100,000 additional college teachers.

Another possible market for young men and women with doctorates are community colleges—today only about 15% of community college faculty members hold doctorates. However, many junior colleges do not at this point seek Ph.D.'s for their faculties, and often the young Ph.D.'s consider jobs in these colleges *infra dig*.

So far, only few changes in the graduate schools' emphasis on research have occurred, but employment pressures may eventually make graduate schools more responsive to society's needs. The growing interest in the new doctor-of-arts (D.A.) degree, deemphasizing research and emphasizing teacher preparation, may be a portent of large scale reorientation among at least some graduate schools.

Economic necessity will soon convince young Ph.D.'s that "Academic Siberia," as the trade tactfully calls it, has its own rewards. In 1935, a recent Ph.D., I accepted a job in a junior college because it was the only job offered me. I found that students in a community college "are no less intelligent than students anywhere else, only less conventionally academic and intellectual," as a young Harvard Ph.D. happily teaching at a California junior college, wrote me recently.

Even if colleges and universities were unable to hire their 50 per cent quota of all new Ph.D.'s, secondary schools, in replacing some of the 80,000 teachers leaving every year, could easily absorb the rest. To do so would help raise the professional level of high school teaching, particularly desirable in the sciences and mathematics—the Nobel laureate Rabi has said that ideally all high school physics teachers should hold doctorates. High school teachers with the Ph.D. or the D.A. could offer more college level courses for gifted and ambitious students. Eventually—as secondary school teachers often did in our past, and still do in Europe—some of these highly trained teachers would move into college teaching. At this juncture, high school teaching jobs are scarce. Eventually the richest country in the world must im-

prove quantity as well as quality of its teachers. Were we to improve the current student-teacher ratio in high schools from one teacher to 20.3 students to one to 19.3, 46,000 additional teachers would be needed. \$460,000,000 needed to pay these seems a great deal of money—when the war is over that sum should not be hard to include in the nation's budget.

Ph. D.'s now teaching in public high schools account for about one twentieth of one percent. Ten thousand additional Ph. D.'s would boost that figure to one percent—a modest step when you consider that many secondary school teachers in other countries hold doctorates. Of the 200 *Gymnasias* in Hesse, for example, only 15 have no Ph. D.'s on their teaching faculties, and 15 have ten or more.

The climate is favorable to change: a good number of high school principals recently surveyed by the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation showed interest in hiring Ph. D.'s, and many Woodrow Wilson Fellows who are teaching in high schools believe that graduate school has given them a solid preparation for their work. Others, currently looking for teaching jobs tell us that they would like to teach in high schools. In some instances their certification may present problems, as will salary scales, but experienced high school administrators generally find ways to cope.

Our country clearly needs more, not less, well-trained and qualified men and women in order to improve the quality of high school education as well as student-teacher ratios. Obviously, not all Ph. D.'s will make good high school teachers, but neither do all those who hold M.A.'s and teaching certificates. Adding a few thousand candidates to the total competing for each year's 80,000 high school teaching posts can only have the effect of improving secondary education.

Prophets of doom notwithstanding, not all our difficulties are insuperable. Instead of lamenting the "glut," let us take advantage of a temporary surplus of trained brains. Now we need imaginative high school principals and school boards, and some moral support from the public.

HANS ROSENHAUPT.

#### PRESIDENT'S PEACE PLAN CAN WORK: UNITY IS THE KEY

#### HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1972

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the President, simultaneously with the President of South Vietnam, has now laid before the world the peace offers that were presented privately to the North Vietnamese delegation at Paris last October. Significantly, these offers include the setting of a date definite for the withdrawal of all American troops, the release of all POW's, and the laying of the groundwork for a political settlement that will make peace possible among all the parties in Indochina without the present South Vietnamese Government being an obstacle to the objective.

It should now be eminently clear to all Americans, even those who have disagreed with the President's policies, and to nations around the world that the United States has, in the President's own words, "gone the extra mile" in attempting to reach a settlement in this

conflict. Nonetheless, the morning papers are already reporting the early indications that the President's revelation of these peace officers has won no new converts, or, perhaps more correctly, that the critics are desperately grasping at straws to keep this a political issue and to keep it alive until at least November.

Senator McGovern, one of the many Democrat candidates for President, is reported to have even gone so far as to say that this blueprint for peace "will not work," observing that "North Vietnam wants a date set for withdrawal." He goes on to point out that—

There's a great difference between offering to set a date and setting a date.

It is precisely this kind of talk that the North Vietnamese are waiting for, you can be sure, so they can be assured of the continued support of those who have been parroting their propaganda line all along. Is there a doubt in any-

one's mind that rather than ignoring these offers since last October, as they have done, the North Vietnamese would have rejected them out-of-hand long ago if the critics right here in the United States had known of them so as to set the stage for their rejection?

Why is it that whenever the North Vietnamese have submitted peace offers in the past, the President's critics have castigated him for not going far enough to test the sincerity of the enemy's proposals? And now, when the President makes this truly milestone initiative, why is he still criticized, this time on the grounds that the plan does not comply to the letter to prior North Vietnamese demands? Is not it now very clear that the North Vietnamese have never intended to negotiate a settlement, but have manipulated the impasse for their own benefit in the belief that the United States will simply abandon South Vietnam?

In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, our

hope at this moment in time is that the North Vietnamese will recognize a viable plan for a peaceful settlement and will not dispense with this opportunity as they have so many others in the past. Let there be no mistaking about it, however, that if the critics right here in our own country persist in lending credibility to the North Vietnamese notion that the whole pie will be theirs if they hold out long enough, the conclusion will be inevitable.

This is a most significant opportunity for all Americans to unite behind our President for the purpose of reaching a conclusion in the war. The record to date is more than revealing that the conflict can only continue with the aid of the President's critics who have consistently imposed as their condition for "Peace" nothing less than a complete Communist victory. We have now passed beyond the point where the North Vietnamese can rely only upon our POW's as their bargaining tool.

## SENATE—Thursday, January 27, 1972

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

### PRAYER

Rabbi Alfred Cohen of the Synagogue of Young Israel of Canarsie, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

God of wisdom and glory, we who are ever humble in Thy presence, stand before Thee in prayer for Thy guidance and compassionate understanding. Bless us with searching hearts and open minds that will ever be sensitive to the many needs of our countrymen.

Bestow Thy blessing of wisdom upon the President and Vice President of our country and upon all the Members of this august body. Strengthen their efforts and inspire their endeavors, so that suffering and evil will be stricken from the face of the earth. Equip them with the courage to champion the cause of justice, and determination to bring the blessings of freedom and equality to all men.

Assure us, dear Lord, of Your inspiration, and bless the work of our hands. By Thy grace, let peace, justice, and brotherhood reign over our land. Amen.

### DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 26, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the distinguished minority leader desire to be recognized at this time?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

### ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this time, in accordance with the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

Is there morning business to be transacted by the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is the Senate operating in the morning hour?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, with a 3-minute limitation on speeches.

### PROCESSING OF 1973 APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement concerning the processing of the fiscal year 1973 appropriation bills, a subject of concern to all of us inasmuch as the 92d Congress will be unable to adjourn until the funding of all necessary governmental programs has been accomplished.

As the Senate is aware, a concentrated effort was made last year to complete action on the appropriation bills as early in the session as possible, and with some success. The record of the Senate committee in reporting the appropriation bills soon after their receipt from the House of Representatives is excellent. The delays in prior years have, for the most part, resulted from the authorizing procedures. There has been a growing consciousness that these authorizing measures must be enacted to permit the Federal agencies to implement their programs early in the fiscal year. The ongoing programs of many agencies have suffered delays.

In my remarks to the Senate on December 15, prior to the adjournment of the first session of this Congress, I stated that in discussions with the leadership it was determined to present to the Senate a program whereby all authorizing bills must be enacted on or before June 1 if they are to be funded in the regular annual appropriation bills. I am happy to report that agreement has been reached on this score, and by joint letter dated January 20, 1972, signed by the distinguished majority and minority leaders, a procedure has been announced, upon the unanimous recommendation of the